arXiv:1612.06983v1 [math.AT] 21 Dec 2016

VARIATIONS OF RATIONAL HIGHER TANGENTIAL STRUCTURES

HISHAM SATI AND MATTHEW WHEELER

Abstract. The study of higher tangential structures, arising from higher connected covers of Lie groups (String, Fivebrane, Ninebrane structures), require considerable machinery for a full description, especially for connections to geometry and applications. With utility in mind, in this paper we study these structures at the rational level and by considering Lie groups as a starting point for defining each of the higher structures, making close connection to p_i-structures. We indicatively call these (rational) *Spin-Fivebrane* and *Spin-Ninebrane* structures. We study the space of such structures and characterize their variations, which reveal interesting effects whereby variations of higher structures are arranged to systematically involve lower ones. These patterns turn out to arise in applications, which we demonstrate within M-theory and string theory. We also study the homotopy type of the gauge group corresponding to bundles equipped with the higher rational structures that we define.

Contents

1. Introduction 1
2. Rationalization of spaces and their approximations 5
2.1. The rational Postnikov and Whitehead towers 5
2.2. Rationalizing higher connected covers 7
2.3. Minimal Models 10
2.4. Rank vs. connectivity degree 11
3. Higher tangential structures 12
3.1. Rational Structures 12
3.2. Variations on rational Fivebrane classes 14
3.3. Variations on rational Ninebrane classes 17
3.4. Gauge transformations 19
3.5. Applications 24
References 26

1. Introduction

Manifolds have been classically studied through structures associated with their tangent bundles leading to characterizations via obstruction theory and characteristic classes [St99] [MS74] [Hu94]. We examine the rationalization of tangential structures, with an emphasis on structures arising from higher connected covers of Lie groups. That is, we consider rationalizing the higher structure groups and their classifying spaces, namely String [Ki88] [ST04], Fivebrane [SSS09] [SSS12], and Ninebrane structures [Sa14]. This has a simplifying feature in that tangential structures from obstruction theory [St99] [Hu94] are algebraically placed in the setting of rational homotopy theory [FHT01] [FHT15] [FOT08] [GM13] [BG76]. This setting allows us to filter out the torsion in our spaces thereby enabling us to have a much better handle on some aspects of these otherwise formidable structures. However, on the flip side, a complication arises when wishing to describe the rationalizations as spaces, since localization in general give rise to topological spaces

which are not always nice [Fa96] [Ne95] [HMR75] [BK72]. Our discussion will strike a balance between the two competing aspects and our goal in this paper is to highlight those features that have transparent descriptions.

Another aim of this paper is to investigate to which extent one can make use of the more familiar Lie group structures in describing the higher ones. In the standard Whitehead tower construction [Wh52], a structure at a given level is built from the structure at the preceding level. However, as we go up in levels, the difficulty in describing the structures in an explicit manner which is amenable to (higher) geometry and to applications seems to grow considerably. Therefore, it would be desirable to explore how much of the bundles of higher connected covers can be described using the Spin group (being a Lie group) rather than having, for instance, to go through String to describe Fivebrane and through Fivebrane to describe Ninebrane structures and so on. Of course one can deal with the these structures directly (see [SSS12] [FSS12] [Sa14]), but that requires considerable machinery. Here we instead take a step back and aim to explore to which extent more classical techniques can be used to probe these structures.

It turns out that the two features, namely rationalizing and utilization of Lie groups in describing the higher connected covers, go hand in hand. The purpose of this paper is to provide a straightforward such description. One of the useful results which makes this possible is that of Neisendorfer [Ne95] (see also [MM97]) whcih states that every finite 2-connected complex can be rationally recovered from its n-connected cover for any n. This is much stronger than saying that these spaces must have nontrivial homotopy in infinite dimensions. As explained in [Fa96] it says that this 'infinite tail' has all the information needed to reconstruct the 'lower-dimensional information'. This then allows us to appropriately introduce (in Sec. 3.2 and Sec. 3.3) the notions of rational *Spin-Fivebrane* and *Spin-Ninebrane structures* as the desired structures arising from starting with Spin rather than with String and Fivebrane, respectively.

In general, we would like to start with a Lie group G and then rationalize, via the rationalization or localization at $\mathbb{Q}$ functor $L_{\mathbb{Q}}$, as well as take connected covers simultaneously. A natural question then is whether these operations are compatible, in the sense of the existence of a diagram of the form

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X & \xrightarrow{\langle n\rangle} & X\langle n\rangle \\ {\scriptstyle L_{\mathbb{Q}}}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle L_{\mathbb{Q}}} \\ X_{\mathbb{Q}} & \xrightarrow{\ ?\ } & X_{\mathbb{Q}}\langle n\rangle\,. \end{array}$$

One of the simplifying features of the process of rationalization is that for group-like spaces it has the effect of killing off any nonabelian structure that exists. Schematically,

$$\text{Rationalization} \rightsquigarrow \text{Homotopy abelianization}.$$

This then gives that all connected cover groups will not only have rational models, but that these will be homotopy abelian. Corresponding statements about the classifying spaces are deduced similarly. Our main focus will be on the secondary structures arising from the groups in the Whitehead tower of the orthogonal group $O(n)$ and, in particular, we will focus on the rationalizations of these groups. Given an $\mathrm{O}(n)\langle k\rangle$-bundle $P \to M$, the obstruction to lifting the structure group to the $(k+1)$-connected cover $\mathrm{O}(n)\langle k+1\rangle$ is given by a cohomology class on M obtained by pulling back the generator $\theta_{k+1} \in H^{k+1}(B\mathrm{O}(n)\langle k\rangle; \pi_k(\mathrm{O}(n)))$ along the classifying map $f : M \to B\mathrm{O}(n)\langle k\rangle$.

Note that for Lie groups, maps between their classifying spaces can be determined via Lie theory, with an intimate connection to rational cohomology [AM76]. In fact, homomorphisms $H^*(BG;\mathbb{Q}) \to H^*(BG',;\mathbb{Q})$ determine corresponding homomorphism with coefficients in $\mathbb{Z}_{(p)}$, the ring of integers localised at a prime p, and in $\mathbb{Z}/p$ the field of integers modulo p, except for a finite number of primes [AM76]. This indicates

that rational cohomology knows quite a bit about the structure of the classifying spaces. We hope that our investigation on rational cohomology of classifying spaces of the connected covers will eventually carry some of the similar features.

From a third point of view, we are interested in considering classes in degrees 3, 7, and 11 arising from the fibers of the bundles, rather than directly from classifying spaces. These secondary classes emerge when trivializing the topological obstructions that occur in degrees 4, 8 and 12. We are interested in the variation of the structures, i.e. in the space of such structures. Given that we are considering higher structures in a way which builds on all the lower levels that precede it, we ask how the variation of that top structure depends on the lower ones all the way down to the bottom-most level, which is a Spin structure.

The rational structures we consider will be characterized by trivializations of (fractions of) the rational Pontrjagin classes p_i. Indeed, we can alternatively view the above structures as variants of p_i-structures, so that we have lifting diagrams



where w_1 is the first Stiefel-Whitney class. Note that we have the obstructions as $\frac{1}{m}p_i^{\mathbb{Q}}$, whose vanishing is equivalent to the vanishing of the rational Pontrjagin class $p_i^{\mathbb{Q}}$ itself, due to the absence of any torsion. The notion of p_1-structures plays an important role in quantum field theories on extended surfaces and 3-manifolds [BHMV95] [Se04][BN14] [FSV16]. Extension to Fivebrane and Ninebrane structures has been considered in [Sa14], and the corresponding twisted versions come up in [Sa13]. We will be interested also in the finite rank case as well as the indefinite signature case, where our main objects will be covers of $SO(n)$ and $SO(q, n-q)$ discussed in Sec. 2.4.

The rational cohomology of $BSO(n)$ splits into cases according to whether n is even or odd

$$H^*(BSO(2n+1);\mathbb{Q}) = \mathbb{Q}[p_1, \cdots, p_n] \ , \qquad H^*(BSO(2n);\mathbb{Q}) = \mathbb{Q}[p_1, \cdots, p_n, e]/(e^2 - p_n) \ ,$$

where $e \in H^{2n}(BSO(2n);\mathbb{Q})$ is the Euler class and $p_i \in H^{4i}(BSO(2n);\mathbb{Q})$ are the rational Pontrjagin classes. Unlike the integral versions, the rational Pontrjagin classes are topological invariants [No65] [RW10], which makes them reliable under homeomorphisms. A vanishing criterion for $p_1^{\mathbb{Q}}$ is given in [Mo93]. It is a classic result (see [We15]) that restrictions of the classes p_i to the classifying space of finite-dimensional vector bundles satisfy the vanishing relations $p_{n+k} = 0 \in H^{4n+4k}(BO(2n);\mathbb{Q})$ for $k > 0$.

The rational Pontrjagin classes have been used in [ERW15] in the context of cobordism spectra. A version of the Witten genus can be described by requiring the rational first Pontrjagin class to vanish; see e.g. [De99] [CHZ11] (and references therein), where a similar definition of a rational structure is used. There, a Spin manifold M is a rational $BO\langle 8\rangle$ manifold if and only if $p_1(M)$ is a torsion class. Furthermore, the rational Pontrjagin classes are used in classifying bundles in [KR94], where it is shown that rank $4n$ vector bundles over the $4n$-sphere S^{4n} are classified by their Euler class and the rational nth Pontrjagin class $p_n^{\mathbb{Q}}$ for $n = 1, 2$. Such bundles classically arise in determining obstructions to lifting to higher connected covers (see [SSS09]). We, therefore, consider the question of the relation of the connectivity to the rank in Section 2.4.

The rational cohomology of the String group has been considered in [SSS09] [BS09]. Also in specific ranks in relation to connectivity degree, $BO(2n)\langle n\rangle$ appear in the context of cobordism categories [ERW15], where the isomorphism $H^*(BO(2n)\langle n\rangle;\mathbb{Q})[-2n] \cong H^*(MT\theta^n;\mathbb{Q})$ of graded vector spaces is established. Here $MT\theta^n$ is the Madsen-Tillman cobordism spectrum with a tangential structure θ^n, i.e. a structure on a space

associated to an n-connected cover. For $n = 4, 8$ and 12, this corresponds in our terminology to rational String, Fivebrane, and Ninebrane structures, respectively.

We consider minimal models (see [FHT01] [FHT15] [FOT08] [GM13] [BG76]) for our rational connected covers straightforwardly in Sec. 2.3. The main idea of Sullivan's approach to rational homotopy theory is to create a functor from the category of 1-connected topological spaces to the category of differential graded commutative algebras (DGCAs) over $\mathbb{Q}$. Such a DGCA is of the form $(\Lambda V, d)$ where the underlying algebra is free commutative and such that there is a basis which admits an ordering so that $d(x_\alpha) \in \Lambda(x_\beta)_{\beta<\alpha}$. Furthermore, (A, d) is minimal if the image of the differential d is contained in the set of decomposable elements, and a minimal model is a quasi-isomorphism $\varphi : (\Lambda V, d) \to (A, d)$ where $(\Lambda V, d)$ is a minimal Sullivan DGCA. In fact every DGCA has a minimal model, and this model is unique up to isomorphism.

Then in the following sections we consider variations on rational String and Fivebrane structures. We use the word variation to mean two things at the same time: First, that we consider variations on the notion of Fivebrane and Ninebrane structures. Second, we consider variations of the actual structures (in their 'parameter space') and consider how these are given in terms of structures stemming from lower levels in the Whitehead tower. Theorem 16 demonstrates the degree to which the underlying Spin bundle can be used to classify lifts of the String bundles rationally. By defining these classes via their restriction on each fiber, we have many nice parallels between the integral and rational cases, as well as between those classes defined on the Spin bundle and those on the String bundle. In some sense, we find that rationally all the information for Fivebrane and Ninebrane structures is encoded in the underlying Spin bundles. Similar arguments and results hold for the Spin-Ninebrane case, except now variations of these involve both String and Fivebrane structure classes.

In Sec. 3.4, we consider automorphisms of the rational structures that we introduced. Rational automorphisms of fiber bundles are considered generally in [Sm01]. Since our higher groups are rationally abelianized, the description will be more straightforward, making use of classic results on mapping spaces to Eilenberg-MacLane spaces [Ha82] [Ha81] [Th57]. We also study the connected covers of the gauge group $\mathcal{G}$ itself and study when a variant of String, Fivebrane, and Ninebrane lifts of $\mathcal{G}$ are possible in relation to corresponding lifts of the structure group G. This turns out to impose strong constraints on both on the underlying space X as well as on G in a correlated manner. We make use of the results on rational homotopy of mapping spaces in [FO09], which generalize those of [Wo07].

In Sec. 3.5 we will present several applications to mathematical physics. We will consider systems arising from gauge theory, string theory and M-theory. In such systems one deals with action functionals which, to some extent, allows us to describe the dynamics of the system. This is mostly classical. However, we are interested in considering certain terms in the action functional, the so-called "topological terms" which are the ones independent of the metric on the underlying manifold. These terms have the virtue that they are trusted upon moving to the quantum regime. Therefore, focusing on the topological terms will allows us to at least set up a corresponding quantum field theoretic construction, namely the partition function Z (see [Fr00] [SSS09] for mathematical treatments associated with such a problem). It is natural to ask whether the physical entities, e.g. the action functional and the partition function, depend on the underlying geometric and topological structures imposed on spacetime. For instance, (in)dependence on the underlying smooth structure plays an important role in global anomalies [Wi85]. Similarly, dependence on the Spin structure is a classical question in string theory [SW86]. One can also ask a related question: How do the physical entities behave under the variation of a corresponding structure? We address these in Sec. 3.5 for the case of our new structures, namely Spin-Fivebrane structures and Spin-Ninebrane structures, applying them to

action functionals in M-theory and for the Green-Schwarz anomaly cancellation. Our expressions, including Lagrangians and action functionals, will be at the level of cohomology.

Some of the calculations in this note are based on the second author's PhD thesis [Wh16]. The point of view and constructions developed here naturally lead to connections to geometry, which we will leave for a separate more thorough treatment to be developed elsewhere.

Notation. We will use the notation $\mathrm{O}\langle n\rangle$ to denote the n-connected cover of the stable orthogonal group O. We use $B\mathrm{O}\langle n+1\rangle$ to mean $B(\mathrm{O}\langle n\rangle)$, so that for our cases of interest $BO\langle 4\rangle = B(\mathrm{O}\langle 3\rangle) = B\mathrm{Spin}$, $BO\langle 8\rangle = B(\mathrm{O}\langle 7\rangle) = B\mathrm{String}$, $BO\langle 12\rangle = B(\mathrm{O}\langle 11\rangle) = B\mathrm{Fivebrane}$, and $BO\langle 16\rangle = B(\mathrm{O}\langle 15\rangle) = B\mathrm{Ninebrane}$.

2. Rationalization of spaces and their approximations

2.1. **The rational Postnikov and Whitehead towers.** We start by briefly reviewing some relevant concepts in rational homotopy theory; see [He07] [FHT01] [FOT08] [GM13] [HMR75].

Definition 1. *A* rational space *Y is a space for which the homotopy groups $\pi_*(Y)$, or the homology groups $\tilde{H}_*(Y;\mathbb{Z})$, or $\tilde{H}_*(\Omega Y;\mathbb{Z})$ is (equivalently) a vector space over $\mathbb{Q}$, where ΩY is the based loop space of Y.*

Definition 2. *A* rationalization *of a space X prescribes a map $\ell_X : X \to X_{\mathbb{Q}}$ to a rational space $X_{\mathbb{Q}}$ such that $\ell_{X*} : \pi_*(X)\otimes\mathbb{Q} \to \pi_*(X_{\mathbb{Q}})$ is an isomorphism, and for every map $f : X \to Y$ where Y is a rational space, there is a factorization*



which is unique up to homotopy.

The second property in Definition 2 tells us that the space $X_{\mathbb{Q}}$ is unique up to homotopy. Suppose $X'_{\mathbb{Q}}$ is another rational space and we have a map $\ell'_X : X \to X'_{\mathbb{Q}}$ satisfying the second property. Then there is a homotopy equivalence $h : X_{\mathbb{Q}} \to X'_{\mathbb{Q}}$, unique up to homotopy, such that



is a homotopy commutative diagram. Note that an abelian group G is said to be $\mathbb{Q}$-local if the map $G\otimes_{\mathbb{Z}}\mathbb{Z} \to G\otimes_{\mathbb{Z}}\mathbb{Q}$ induced by the inclusion $\mathbb{Z}\hookrightarrow\mathbb{Q}$ is an isomorphism. Then Definition 1 can be restated as saying that the following holds [Su74]

$$X \text{ is } \mathbb{Q}-\text{local} \iff \pi_n(X) \text{ is } \mathbb{Q}-\text{local} \iff \widetilde{H}_n(X;\mathbb{Z}) \text{ is } \mathbb{Q}-\text{local}\,, \qquad n \geqslant 2.$$

A space X admits a rationalization if it is nilpotent, i.e. if its first homotopy group π_1 is a nilpotent group and if π_1 acts nilpotently on the higher homotopy groups. In particular, any simply connected space is trivially nilpotent. Note, however, that an extension to non-simply connected spaces is possible (see [FHT15]). This allows us, for instance, to start our Whitehead tower (Example 3 below) with $\mathrm{SO}(n)$ or $B\mathrm{O}(n)$, as in [SS15].

Example 1 (Eilenberg-MacLane spaces)**.** *Consider the integral Eilenberg-MacLane space $K(\mathbb{Z},n)$. Then the map $\iota_{\mathbb{Q}} : K(\mathbb{Z},n) \to K(\mathbb{Q},n)$ corresponding to the generator $[\iota_{\mathbb{Q}}] \in H^n(K(\mathbb{Z},n),\mathbb{Q})$ is a rationalization of $K(\mathbb{Z},n)$. In general, an Eilenberg-MacLane space $K(\pi,n)$ can be rationalized to $K(\pi\otimes\mathbb{Q},n)$ induced by the natural homomorphism $\pi \to \pi\otimes\mathbb{Q}$. By induction and use of the Serre spectral sequence one can show*

that $H^*(K(\mathbb{Q},2n);\mathbb{Q})$ is a $\mathbb{Q}$-polynomial algebra on one generator of degree $2n$, while $H^*(K(\mathbb{Q},2n+2);\mathbb{Q})$ is a $\mathbb{Q}$-exterior algebra on one generator of degree $2n+1$. Furthermore, $K(\mathbb{Z},n) \to K(\mathbb{Q},n)$ induces an isomorphism on rational cohomology. That is there are isomorphisms (see [GM13] [Mo01]*)*

$$\begin{aligned} H^*(K(\mathbb{Z},2n);\mathbb{Q}) &\cong H^*(K(\mathbb{Q},2n);\mathbb{Q}) \cong \mathbb{Q}[\iota] \,, \\ H^*(K(\mathbb{Z},2n+1);\mathbb{Q}) &\cong H^*(K(\mathbb{Q},2n+1);\mathbb{Q}) \cong E_{\mathbb{Q}}[\iota] \,, \end{aligned}$$

where $\iota \in H^n(K(\mathbb{Q},n);\mathbb{Q})$ is the fundamental cohomology class.

To construct a rationalization for a simply connected space X, one can use the Postnikov tower decomposition of X and localize at each step of the tower.

Example 2 (Postnikov tower)**.** *Recall that the Postnikov tower of X (see e.g.* [Ha02]*) is a sequence of spaces and maps*

$$X \to \cdots \to X_{(n)} \xrightarrow{\varphi_n} \cdots \xrightarrow{\varphi_2} X_{(1)} \xrightarrow{\varphi_1} X_{(0)} \,,$$

where the map φ_n is a fibration for every n, for each space $X_{(n)}$, one has $\pi_i(X_{(n)}) = 0$ for $i > n$, and the induced map $\varphi_{n*} : \pi_i(X_{(n)}) \to \pi_i(X_{(n-1)})$ is an isomorphism for $i < n$. Now assume that we have a localization $\ell_{(n-1)} : X_{(n-1)} \to X_{(n-1)\mathbb{Q}}$. The principal fibration $X_{(n)} \to X_{(n-1)}$ is the pullback of the path fibration $PK(\pi_n(X), n+1) \to K(\pi_n(X), n+1)$ by the Postnikov invariant $k^{n+1} \in H^{n+1}(X_{(n-1)}, \pi_n(X))$. Now define $X_{(n)\mathbb{Q}}$ to be the pullback of the fibration $PK(\pi_n(X)\otimes\mathbb{Q}, n+1) \to K(\pi_n(X)\otimes\mathbb{Q}, n+1)$ by the rationalized Postnikov invariant

$$k^{n+1} \otimes \mathbb{Q} \in H^{n+1}(X_{(n-1)\mathbb{Q}},\ \pi_n(X)\otimes\mathbb{Q}) \,.$$

This then gives the localization map $\ell_{(n)} : X_{(n)} \to X_{(n)\mathbb{Q}}$, completing the induction. Defining $X_{\mathbb{Q}}$ as the inverse limit $X_{\mathbb{Q}} := \varprojlim X_{(n)\mathbb{Q}}$, the rationalization of X is then the induced map $\ell_X : X \to X_{\mathbb{Q}}$.

We now consider the dual notion of the Whitehead tower [Wh52] and its rationalization.

Example 3 (Whitehead tower)**.** *The Whitehead tower is a sequence of spaces*

$$\cdots \to X\langle n\rangle \to X\langle n-1\rangle \to \cdots \to X\langle 1\rangle \to X$$

where each space $X\langle n\rangle$ is n-connected, and the map $X\langle n\rangle \to X$ induces isomorphisms on the homotopy groups π_i for each $i > n$. As with the Postnikov tower, the Whitehead tower may be constructed by induction. Given an $(n-1)$-connected cover $X\langle n-1\rangle$ of X, there is a map $w_n : X\langle n-1\rangle \to K(\pi_n(X), n)$ corresponding to the generator of $H^n(X\langle n-1\rangle; \pi_n(X))$. Then the space $X\langle n\rangle$ is constructed as the homotopy fiber of w_n. Equivalently one may construct the Whitehead tower over the rationalization $X_{\mathbb{Q}}$ of X (see e.g. Ch. 2 in [Kr02]*). By choosing $w_{n+1}\otimes\mathbb{Q} : X\langle n-1\rangle \to K(\pi_n(X)\otimes\mathbb{Q}, n)$ as the classifying map for the generator of the cohomology group*

$$H^n(X\langle n-1\rangle_{\mathbb{Q}}; \pi_n(X_{\mathbb{Q}})) \cong H^n(X\langle n-1\rangle_{\mathbb{Q}}; \pi_n(X)\otimes\mathbb{Q}) \,,$$

then the homotopy pullback $X\langle n+1\rangle_{\mathbb{Q}}$ is the rationalization of $X\langle n\rangle$. This also follows by induction. Given that $\ell_{n-1} : X\langle n-1\rangle \to X\langle n-1\rangle_{\mathbb{Q}}$ is a localization of $X\langle n-1\rangle$, we can consider the following commutative diagram



The map $\ell_n : X\langle n\rangle \to X\langle n\rangle_{\mathbb{Q}}$ exists by the universal property of pullbacks and, by the commutativity of the diagram, this map is a rational homotopy equivalence.

Remark 1. *In the following sections we will be concerned with the rational Whitehead tower of $B\mathrm{O}$. In light of this, we briefly describe one important quality of the rational Whitehead tower. The general construction of each stage of the Whitehead tower is as the homotopy fiber of a map representing a generator of cohomology. Consider a map $f : X \to K(A, n)$ and suppose that f represents a generator of $H^n(X; A)$. Composing f with the rationalization $\iota : K(A, n) \to K(A \otimes \mathbb{Q}, n)$ gives a generator $f^*\iota \in H^n(A; \mathbb{Q})$. Then for any $r \in \mathbb{Q}$, the class $r \cdot f^*\iota$ is also a generator. Now by the universal property of rationalization, there is a map $f_{\mathbb{Q}} : X_{\mathbb{Q}} \to K(A \otimes \mathbb{Q}, n)$ as well as a map $r \cdot f_{\mathbb{Q}} : X_{\mathbb{Q}} \to K(A \otimes \mathbb{Q}, n)$. Denote the homotopy fibers of each of theses maps as $F(f_{\mathbb{Q}})$ and $F(rf_{\mathbb{Q}})$. The key point here is to note that these spaces are homotopy equivalent. This follows from the fact the map $r : K(\mathbb{Q}, n) \to K(\mathbb{Q}, n)$ representing r times the identity induces an isomorphism on the rational cohomology of rational spaces and thus is a homotopy equivalence combined with the fact that $r \cdot f^*\iota = f^*\iota^* r$. This is in contrast to the case where we compare $hofib(f)$ and $hofib(nf)$ for some integer $n \neq \pm 1$. These are not homotopy equivalent spaces for the reason that n is not a unit in $\mathbb{Z}$.*

2.2. **Rationalizing higher connected covers.** The groups we consider will be rationally built out of spheres. Since the homotopy groups $\pi_j(S^{2m+1})$ of an odd-dimensional sphere S^{2m+1} are finite except in top degree $j = 2m + 1$, the rationalization is $\ell_{\mathbb{Q}} : S^{2m+1} \to K(\mathbb{Q}, 2m + 1)$ corresponding to a nontrivial class in $H^{2m+1}(S^{2m+1}; \mathbb{Q})$. This implies that we have rational equivalences $S^{2m+1} \simeq_{\mathbb{Q}} K(\mathbb{Z}, 2m+1) \simeq_{\mathbb{Q}} K(\mathbb{Q}, 2m+1)$. As a result, odd-dimensional spheres have the rational homotopy type of an abelian topological group.

The rational cohomology of a Lie group G is the same as that of a product of odd-dimensional spheres

$$H^*(G; \mathbb{Q}) \cong H^*(\prod S^{2i-1}; \mathbb{Q}) \ ,$$

which implies that G has the same rational homotopy type as that product. For our main example,

$$\mathrm{Spin}(2n) \simeq_{\mathbb{Q}} S^3 \times S^7 \times \cdots \times S^{2n-1} \ , \qquad \mathrm{Spin}(2n+1) \simeq_{\mathbb{Q}} S^3 \times S^7 \times \cdots \times S^{4n-1} \ .$$

Since every Lie group is in particular an H-space, the Cartan-Serre theorem implies that the rationalization $G_{\mathbb{Q}}$ of G has the homotopy type of a product of Eilenberg-MacLane spaces. This $G_{\mathbb{Q}}$ can be made into a topological group by insisting that the rationalization functor $G \to G_{\mathbb{Q}}$ preserves products, thereby becoming a group homomorphism.

We can consider the question of rationalization of higher topological groups in some generality. Suppose G is a topological group having the homotopy type of a CW complex. Rationalization commutes with products only up to homotopy. This implies that the rationalization of the product structure gives a map $\mu_{\mathbb{Q}} : G_{\mathbb{Q}} \times G_{\mathbb{Q}} \to G_{\mathbb{Q}}$, which may fail to be a multiplication. However, it is a group-like H-space. The map $\ell_{\mathbb{Q}} : G \to G_{\mathbb{Q}}$ is a homomorphism of H-spaces, i.e. the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} G \times G & \xrightarrow{\mu} & G \\ {\scriptstyle \ell_{\mathbb{Q}} \times \ell_{\mathbb{Q}}}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \ell_{\mathbb{Q}}} \\ G_{\mathbb{Q}} \times G_{\mathbb{Q}} & \xrightarrow{\mu_{\mathbb{Q}}} & G_{\mathbb{Q}} \end{array}$$

commutes up to homotopy, and the homomorphism is compatible with homotopy associativity. When G is connected, the commutator map $\mu_{\mathbb{Q}} : G_{\mathbb{Q}} \times G_{\mathbb{Q}} \to G_{\mathbb{Q}}$ is null homotopic [KSS09].

Remark 2 (Group structure on rationalization of topological groups)**.** *The above group structure does not coincide up to homotopy with the H-space structure on the product of Eilenberg-MacLane spaces. Indeed, in* [Ar89] *it is shown that there is a rational homotopy equivalence $G_{\mathbb{Q}} \cong \prod_n K(\pi_n(G_{\mathbb{Q}}), n)$ which is an*

equivalence in the category of rational H-spaces if and only if G is homotopy abelian. Since $\mathbb{Q}$ is a countable abelian group, the multiplication of loops gives $K(\mathbb{Q}, n)$ the structure of abelian topological group, and this structure is unique up to homotopy [Mi59]*. Consequently, the product $\prod_{j\geqslant 1} K(\mathbb{Q}, n_j)$ of Eilenberg-MacLane spaces with the standard loop multiplication also has the structure of an abelian topological group. Indeed, by rationalizing the product of spheres, we get that the rationalization is a product of rational Eilenberg-MacLane spaces. Alternatively, we can apply the H-space results in* [LPSS09, Lemma 4.14] *to our situation to deduce that the rationalization is given as*

$$\ell_{\mathbb{Q}} : G \to \prod_{j\geqslant 1} K(\pi_j(G) \otimes \mathbb{Q}, j) \ .$$

This is a functor which is natural in G. Furthermore, note that rationalization commutes with finite products up to homotopy (see e.g. [KSS09]*), which is the case for G a finite rank Lie group.*

Note that the resulting rationalizations of the connected cover groups and their classifying spaces in this section end up having nice models. Explicitly, they end up being products of rational Eilenberg-MacLane spaces. Spaces are in general twisted products of Eilenberg-MacLane spaces arranged by their Postnikov decompositions. So in this case rationalization trivializes the Postnikov k-invariants, thereby untwisting the product of Eilenberg-MacLane spaces into a straight product. This can also be discussed on general grounds. If X be a topological space which is a CW-complex then the rationalization $X_{\mathbb{Q}}$ is also a CW-complex.

We now consider compatibility of rationalization with taking connected covers. Indeed, such a problem can be studied systematically, building on classical results. Consider localization L_f at every prime, i.e. with respect to a map $f : \bigvee_p B\mathbb{Z}/p \to *$ with domain the infinite bouquet. Let E be defined by the homotopy pullback diagram

(2.1)
$$\begin{array}{ccc} E & \longrightarrow & X\langle n\rangle_{\mathbb{Q}} \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ X & \longrightarrow & X_{\mathbb{Q}} \ , \end{array}$$

where X is a simply connected finite complex with $\pi_2(X)$ finite. Then $L_f X\langle n\rangle$ has the homotopy type of E [Ne95]. We now connect this to the Whitehead tower of the rationalized orthogonal group. Since every level of that Whitehead tower is a rationalization [Fa96, Theorem A.1] this implies that at every level we will have a space which is at least an H-space. These will include all connected covers. Let us apply the above localization (2.1) to $X = \mathrm{Spin}(n)$, which is 2-connected.

Example 4 (Rationalization of the 3-connected cover of $\mathrm{Spin}(n)$)**.** *Let Spin_τ be the homotopy fiber of the rationalization $\mathrm{Spin} \to \mathrm{Spin}_{\mathbb{Q}}$. Starting with the fiber sequence $K(\mathbb{Z}, 2) \to \mathrm{String}(n) = \mathrm{Spin}(n)\langle 3\rangle \to \mathrm{Spin}(n)$, we have $K(\mathbb{Z}, 2) \otimes \mathbb{Q} \simeq K(\mathbb{Q}, 2)$ as the homotopy fiber of $E \to \mathrm{Spin}(n)$ and $K(\mathbb{Z}, 2)_\tau$ as the homotopy fiber of $\mathrm{String}(n) \to E$. The hypotheses imply that E has the same rational homology as $\mathrm{Spin}(n)$, so that E is f-local and that $K(\mathbb{Z}, 2)_\tau$ is connected. The homotopy groups of the latter are locally finite. Now the main point (see* [Ne95]*) is that if Y is an f-local space, then by studying the Postnikov factorization, every map $\mathrm{String}(n) \to Y$ has up to homotopy a unique extension to a map $E \to Y$. This identifies $L_f\mathrm{String}(n)$ as E.*

Summarizing, when G is a connected topological group having the homotopy type of a finite CW complex, then we have that $G_{\mathbb{Q}}$ is a homotopy commutative H-space. It is homotopy equivalent as an H-space to a product of Eilenberg-MacLane spaces with *standard multiplication* [KSS09]. However, a priori the multiplication is not unique, as a product of Eilenberg-MacLane spaces may admit many non-H-equivalent H-structures (see [Cu68]). Nevertheless, for our types of G this rational equivalence will be multiplicative (see [LPSS09, Corollary 4.26 and 4.27]). Therefore, we have

Proposition 3. *In the Whitehead tower of the orthogonal group, each element in the sequence of connected covering spaces* $\{\mathrm{String}(n)_{\mathbb{Q}}$, $\mathrm{Fivebrane}(n)_{\mathbb{Q}}$, $\mathrm{Ninebrane}(n)_{\mathbb{Q}}$, $\cdots\}$ *is an abelian topological group with a unique multiplication.*

We now consider the rationalization of the classifying spaces of Lie groups and their higher connected covers. For classifying spaces, the Borel-Hopf theorem implies that the map $(BG)_{\mathbb{Q}} \to B(G_{\mathbb{Q}})$ induced by the homomorphism $\ell_{\mathbb{Q}} : G \to G_{\mathbb{Q}}$ is a homotopy equivalence, and we have

$$H^*(BG; \mathbb{Q}) \cong \mathbb{Q}[y_1, \cdots, y_k] \ ,$$

where each generator y_i is of even degree. Note that for the classifying spaces in terms of even generators, one cannot deduce a similar relation to spheres as above, since the rational model for even-dimensional spheres is not free. It is known that the minimal model (see Sec. 2.3) of BG is evenly generated and has zero differential, i.e. BG is rationally a product of even-dimensional Eilenberg-MacLane spaces. The above argument also applies if we have infinitely many y_i's in even degrees, as in the case for BString, BFivebrane and BNinebrane, as long as there are only finitely many y_i in each even degree. This follows from the fact that two nilpotent spaces with finite Betti numbers are rationally homotopy equivalent if and only if they have isomorphic minimal models. When G is connected, the classifying space BG has the rational homotopy type of a generalized Eilenberg-MacLane space (see [FO09] for another explicit description) and, in particular, it is rationally homotopy equivalent to a loop space [KSS09]. This implies that we can deloop as much as we desire.

Note that the behavior of the rationalization of a Lie group G is intimately linked to that of its classifying space BG. Two compact Lie groups G and H are isomorphic if and only if their classifying spaces BG and BH are homotopy equivalent [Mø02] [Os92] [No95]. The equivalences at the rational level are established in [Mø02]. Since, rationally, taking the classifying functor only shifts the degree of the generators, then in this case we have that, rationally, BG is a product of even-dimensional Eilenberg-MacLane spaces. Similarly in this case, taking connected covers gives the rational models for the higher connected covers of the classifying spaces. Indeed, for the case of String this can be found explicitly for instance via the Serre spectral sequence (see [SSS09] [BS09]). The higher cases work similarly. Therefore, we have

Proposition 4. *Given that the rational cohomology of* $BG_{\mathbb{Q}}$ *is* $\mathbb{Q}[x_{2i}]$ *(where* i *can be odd or even), the rational cohomology of the connected cover* $BG\langle n\rangle_{\mathbb{Q}}$ *is* $\mathbb{Q}[x_{2j}]$*, where* j *includes all values of* i *for which* $j > i - n$*. The same holds for the rational homotopy type.*

Another way to relate $G\langle n\rangle_{\mathbb{Q}}$ to $B(G\langle n\rangle)_{\mathbb{Q}} = BG\langle n+1\rangle_{\mathbb{Q}}$ is as follows. Rationalization is a weak rational equivalence $X \to L_{\mathbb{Q}}(X) = X_{(0)}$, where $L_{\mathbb{Q}}$ is the $\mathbb{Q}$-localization functor. One of the main properties of the functor $L_{\mathbb{Q}}$ is that preserves sequences and split suspensions, as well as commutes with fiber and cofiber sequences for simply connected spaces [Su74]. Furthermore, suspension and looping preserve the rationality of the spaces involved. More precisely, for any simply connected space X, the loop space of its rationalization is $\Omega X_{\mathbb{Q}} \simeq \prod_\alpha K(\mathbb{Q}, m_\beta)$ for various values of m_β [St13]. Note that in one approach to the String group, it is taken to be the loop space of its classifying space, with the latter constructed first (see [SSS12]). Indeed, for $Y = BG\langle n\rangle$ a pointed topological space, the assignment $X \mapsto [X, \Omega BG\langle n\rangle]_* := \mathrm{Top}_*(X, \Omega BG\langle n\rangle)/\simeq_*$ defines a functor $[-, \Omega BG\langle n\rangle]_* = \mathrm{Top}_*^{\mathrm{op}} \to \mathrm{Grp}$ from the category of pointed topological spaces to the category of groups, where the multiplication in $[X, \Omega BG\langle n\rangle]_*$ is pointwise (see [Pi93, Thm. 1.2.5] for the corresponding classical statement). Starting with $X = B\mathrm{String}$ and rationalizing $X_{\mathbb{Q}} \simeq (B\mathrm{String})_{\mathbb{Q}}$, then taking the loop space leads to

$$\mathrm{String}_{\mathbb{Q}} := \Omega(B\mathrm{String})_{\mathbb{Q}} \simeq \prod_\alpha K(\mathbb{Q}, m_\beta) \ .$$

The values of m_β can be deduced from another approach, namely starting with the Spin group, taking connected covers and then rationalizing, as we did earlier. A similar treatment for Fivebrane and Ninebrane can be established in parallel. Overall, we can arrive at the result of Prop. 3, i.e. that the rational models for $\mathrm{Spin}\langle k\rangle(n)_{\mathbb{Q}}$ and $B\mathrm{Spin}\langle k\rangle(n)_{\mathbb{Q}}$ are indeed given as products of rational Eilenberg-MacLane spaces.

2.3. **Minimal Models.** Now we present minimal models (see [FHT01] [FHT15] [FOT08] [GM13] [BG76]) for our connected covers in a straightforward manner. Given a space X, one can assign the complex of piecewise linear differential forms, $A^*_{PL}(X)$ (see [GM13] for a definition). This assignment defines a functor from the category of topological spaces to the category of CDGAs over the rationals. A minimal model for a CDGA (A, d) is given by a quasi-isomorphism $\varphi : (\Lambda V, d_V) \to (A, d_A)$ where ΛV is freely generated and the image of d_V is contained in the set of decomposable elements of ΛV. For a space X, a minimal model for X is defined to be a minimal model for $A^*_{PL}(X)$. Let $E \xrightarrow{p} B$ be a quasi-nilpotent fibration with fiber F, let $f : B' \to B$ be a map of base spaces, and let $E' \xrightarrow{p'} B'$ denote the pullback of p along f. Let $(\Lambda V, d) \to (\Lambda V \otimes \Lambda W, d) \to (\Lambda W, \bar{d})$ denote the relative minimal model for the fibration p and let $\phi : (\Lambda V, d) \to (\Lambda V', d')$ denote the relative minimal model for f. The following standard result from rational homotopy theory provides a recipe for constructing a minimal model of a pullback (see [FHT01] [FOT08]). The relative minimal model

$$(\Lambda V', d') \to (\Lambda V' \otimes \Lambda W, D) \to (\Lambda W, \bar{D})$$

is the relative minimal model for the pullback fibration p'. Here D is defined by $D(w) = (\phi \otimes 1)(Dw)$ where $\phi \otimes 1 : \Lambda V \otimes \Lambda W \to \Lambda V' \otimes \Lambda W$. The CDGA $(\Lambda V' \otimes \Lambda W, D)$ is defined as $(\Lambda V', d') \otimes_{\Lambda V} (\Lambda V \otimes \Lambda W, d)$.

Consider the rational whitehead tower of $B\mathrm{O}(n)$. Recall (Example 3) that this tower can be constructed as a system of pullbacks where at each step of the tower, the space $B\mathrm{O}(n)\langle 4k+3\rangle$ is formed via the pullback of the pathspace fibration $PK(\mathbb{Q}, 4k) \to K(\mathbb{Q}, 4k)$ along a map $p_k : B\mathrm{O}(n)\langle 4k-1\rangle \to K(\mathbb{Q}, 4k)$ which can be thought of as a rationalization of the k-th Pontrjagin class.

The relative minimal model for the pathspace fibration of a space X is given by $(\Lambda V, d) \to (\Lambda V \otimes \Lambda sV, d) \to (\Lambda sV, \bar{d})$ where an element $sv \in \Lambda sV$ has degree $|sv| = |v| - 1$. As the minimal model for the Eilenberg-MacLane space $K(\mathbb{Q}, 4k)$ is given by $(\Lambda(x_{4k}), 0)$, then it follows that the minimal model for the pathspace fibration is given by $(\Lambda(x_{4k}), 0) \to (\Lambda(x_{4k}, sx_{4k}), d) \to (\Lambda(sx_{4k}), 0)$ where the differential d is given by $d(x_{4k}) = 0$ and $d(sx_{4k}) = x_{4k}$. Then we immediately have the following.

Proposition 5. *A relative minimal model for the fibration $B(\mathrm{O}(n)\langle 4p+3\rangle) \to B(\mathrm{O}(n)\langle 4p-1\rangle)$ i.e. of the fibration $B\mathrm{O}\langle 4p+4\rangle \to B\mathrm{O}\langle 4p\rangle$ is given by*

$$\big(\Lambda(x_{4p}, x_{4p+4}, \ldots, x_{4n+4}),\ 0\big) \longrightarrow \big(\Lambda(x_{4p}, \ldots, x_{4n+4}) \otimes \Lambda(x_{4p}, sx_{4p}),\ d\big) \longrightarrow \big(\Lambda(x_{4p}, sx_{4p}),\ 0\big)\ ,$$

where $d(sx_{4p}) = x_{4p}$ and 0 otherwise.

Example 5. **(i)** *In the case of the fibration* $\mathrm{Fivebrane}(n) \to \mathrm{String}(n)$*, it follows that the minimal model is*

$$(\Lambda(x_8, x_{12}, \ldots, x_{4n+4}),\ 0) \longrightarrow (\Lambda(x_8, \cdots, x_{4n+4}) \otimes \Lambda(x_8, sx_8),\ d) \longrightarrow (\Lambda(x_8, sx_8),\ 0)\ ,$$

where x_8 is the element corresponding to the second Pontrjagin class.
(ii) *In the case of the fibration* $\mathrm{Ninebrane}(n) \to \mathrm{Fivebrane}(n)$*, the minimal model is*

$$(\Lambda(x_{12}, \ldots, x_{4n+4}),\ 0) \longrightarrow (\Lambda(x_{12}, \cdots, x_{4n+4}) \otimes \Lambda(x_{12}, sx_{12}),\ d) \longrightarrow (\Lambda(x_{12}, sx_{12}),\ 0)\ ,$$

where x_{12} is the element corresponding to the third Pontrjagin class.

2.4. **Rank vs. connectivity degree.** In this section we will highlight how the rank n of the Spin group $\mathrm{Spin}(n)$ will have an effect on the corresponding k-connected cover. We start with identifying the minimal rank so that the resulting rationalizations are not trivial, after which we consider the indefinite case $\mathrm{Spin}(p,q)$.

Example 6 (The unstable case: $\mathrm{String}(3)$)**.** *The case $n=3$ is special. From the point of view of classifying spaces, the generator $Q_1 = \frac{1}{2}p_1$ in $H^4(B\mathrm{Spin}(3);\mathbb{Z})$ is further divisible by 2, or the first Pontrjagin class pulled back from $B\mathrm{SO}(3)$ via the covering map $\mathrm{Spin}(3) \to \mathrm{O}(3)$ is divisible by 4. This has interesting consequences that we will not pursue here (see* [Re11] [Sa10]*). From the rational point of view, however, the story is different. Consider the identification $\mathrm{Spin}(3) \cong S^3$. Now forming $\mathrm{String}(3)$ is equivalent to forming the 3-connected cover $S^3\langle 3\rangle$ of the 3-sphere. This latter space is known to be torsion. This is essentially due to Serre's result that $\pi_j(S^3)$ is finite for $j>3$. Indeed forming the fibration $\mathrm{String}(3) \to \mathrm{Spin}(3) \to K(\mathbb{Z},3)$ and rationalizing, we consider the fibration $\mathrm{Spin}_\tau(3) \to \mathrm{Spin}(3) \to \mathrm{Spin}(3)_\mathbb{Q}$, where the leftmost term is the homotopy fiber to be determined. This is homotopy equivalent to the fibration $S^3_\tau \to S^3 \to S^3_\mathbb{Q}$, where $S^3_\mathbb{Q} \simeq K(\mathbb{Q},3) \simeq M(\mathbb{Q},3)$ and the homotopy fiber $S^3_\tau \simeq M(\mathbb{Q}/\mathbb{Z},2)$ is the Moore space for the quotient $\mathbb{Q}/\mathbb{Z}$.*

In order to generalize to higher connected covers, we note that in the case of $n=3$, we have $\dim(\mathrm{Spin}(n)) = 3$, and the generator of $\pi_3(\mathrm{Spin}(3))$ corresponds to the fundamental class in $H^3(\mathrm{Spin}(3);\mathbb{Z})$. In the general case the dimension of $\mathrm{Spin}(n)$ is $d = \frac{1}{2}n(n-1)$. Now, while it is true that $\mathrm{Spin}(n)$ that $\mathrm{Spin}(n)\langle\frac{1}{2}n(n-1)\rangle$ are torsion spaces and thus rationally trivial, we can state a sharper result.

Proposition 6. *The k-connected cover of rank n, $\mathrm{Spin}(n)\langle k\rangle_\mathbb{Q}$, is homotopy trivial for $k = 4\cdot\lfloor\frac{n-1}{2}\rfloor - 1$.*

Proof. It is a classic result that the rational cohomology $H^*(\mathrm{Spin}(n);\mathbb{Q})$ is isomorphic to the exterior algebra $\Lambda_\mathbb{Q}(x_3,x_7,\ldots,x_{4i-1})$ when n is odd and to $\Lambda_\mathbb{Q}(x_3,x_7,\ldots,x_{4i-1},y_{n-1})$ for n even, where $i = \lfloor\frac{n-1}{2}\rfloor$. Moreover it is clear that these algebras, equipped with the zero differential, describe a minimal model for $\mathrm{Spin}(n)$ (see Sec. 2.3). From rational homotopy we know that $V^n \cong \mathrm{Hom}(\pi_n(\mathrm{Spin}(n)),\mathbb{Q})$ where V^n denotes the vector space of degree n generators. Thus it follows that the non-torsion class of highest degree is in degree $4\cdot\lfloor\frac{n-1}{2}\rfloor - 1$ and, upon killing this homotopy class in the Whitehead tower, the resulting space is pure torsion. □

Of course the statement of the proposition holds trivially for $k > 4\cdot\lfloor\frac{n-1}{2}\rfloor - 1$. Thus we have that $\mathrm{Fivebrane}(5)_\mathbb{Q} =: \mathrm{Spin}(5)\langle 7\rangle_\mathbb{Q}$ and $\mathrm{Ninebrane}(8)_\mathbb{Q} =: \mathrm{Spin}(8)\langle 11\rangle_\mathbb{Q}$ are torsion spaces.

Remark 3 (The indefinite case $\mathrm{Spin}\langle k\rangle(p,q)$)**.** *Note that we can consider rationalization of higher structures in the indefinite signature, i.e. by taking connected covers of the semi-orthogonal $SO(p,q)$, prominent in semi-Riemannian geometry. For degree 3, i.e. for $\mathrm{String}(p,q)$, these are characterized in* [SS15]*. The homotopy groups encountered there are complicated, but upon rationalizing the problem becomes much more tractable: If $p,q<3$ then the problem is trivial. If we have $p=q=3$ then we have two copies of the trivialization of the 3-connected cover of S^3, which is pure torsion (as in Example 6). For $p=q=4$, we have four copies of $S^3\langle 3\rangle$. So far the rationalization of all these cases is trivial. Once we reach $p,q\geqslant 5$ then we have two copies of the nontrivial problem, i.e. a rationalization of $\mathrm{String}(p)$ and of $\mathrm{String}(q)$. The cases when $p\neq q$ can be dealt with similarly.*

Given the discussions in previous sections, the descriptions of the higher connected covers $\mathrm{Fivebrane}(p,q)_\mathbb{Q}$ and $\mathrm{Ninebrane}(p,q)$ rationally will follow analogously. Note that this is in stark contrast with the calculations in [SS15] where the various torsion groups arising notoriously in the indefinite case made the extension to Fivebrane and Ninebrane not immediately possible.

Proposition 7. *Let $\mathrm{Spin}\langle k\rangle(p,q)$ denote the k-connected cover of the indefinite Spin group $\mathrm{Spin}(p,q)$.*

(i) *The rationalization takes the form*

$$\mathrm{Spin}\langle k\rangle(p,q)_{\mathbb{Q}} \simeq \mathrm{Spin}\langle k\rangle(p)_{\mathbb{Q}} \times \mathrm{Spin}\langle k\rangle(q)_{\mathbb{Q}} \qquad \text{if } k < 4\cdot\lfloor\tfrac{\min\{p,q\}-1}{2}\rfloor - 1\ .$$

(ii) *When $p = q$ are such that $k = 4\cdot\lfloor\frac{p-1}{2}\rfloor - 1 = 4\cdot\lfloor\frac{p-1}{2}\rfloor - 1$ this rationalization is trivial, i.e. the resulting spaces are torsion spaces.*

The cases when p or q is less than the above bound involving k can be treated in the same way as in the String case above. Clearly, when only either p or q satisfies the condition of the proposition then the result holds only for that part.

3. Higher tangential structures

3.1. **Rational Structures.** Let G be a simply connected topological group. For a principal G-bundle $P \to M$ and a homomorphism $\rho : H \to G$, we will say that the structure group of P lifts to another topological group H if there is a principal H-bundle $Q \to M$ and a bundle isomorphism $Q \times_\rho G \cong P$ over M. From a homotopy theoretic perspective, we can associate to any G-bundle $P \to M$ a classifying map $f : M \to BG$ which is unique up to homotopy. The homomorphism $\rho : H \to G$ induces a map of classifying spaces, $B\rho : BH \to BG$. Then a lifting of the structure group from G to H corresponds to a lifting of the classifying map along $B\rho$, i.e. a map $\tilde{f} : M \to BH$ making the following diagram commute

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & & BH \\ & \overset{\tilde{f}}{\nearrow} & \big\downarrow{\scriptstyle B\rho} \\ M & \xrightarrow{\ f\ } & BG. \end{array}$$

The isomorphism classes of H-structures on the bundle $P \to M$ are classified by homotopy classes of lifts $\tilde{f}$ of f. Note that this can be formulated via honest tensor products of bundles (in place of the fiber product) [Ro16].

Given an $\mathrm{O}(n)\langle k\rangle$-bundle, $P \to M$, which admits an $\mathrm{O}(n)\langle k+1\rangle$-structure, the set of lifts or $\mathrm{O}(n)\langle k+1\rangle$-structures on P is classified up to isomorphism by cohomology classes in $H^k(P;\pi_k(\mathrm{O}(n))$. This cohomology class on M is obtained by pulling back the generator $\theta_{k+1} \in H^{k+1}(B\mathrm{O}(n)\langle k+1\rangle;\pi_k(\mathrm{O}(n)))$ along the classifying map $f : M \to B\mathrm{O}(n)\langle k+1\rangle$. To see this, one looks at the Serre spectral sequence corresponding to the bundle $P \to M$ where the cohomology has coefficients $\pi_k(\mathrm{O}(n))$. Since the fiber is $\mathrm{O}(n)\langle k\rangle$ and thus k-connected, then the differential d_k of this spectral sequence defines, for each $x \in M$, a cohomology suspension

$$d_k : H^k(P_x;\pi_k(\mathrm{O}(n))) \longrightarrow H^{k+1}(M;\pi_k(\mathrm{O}(n)))\ .$$

After identifying the fiber P_x with $\mathrm{O}(n)\langle k\rangle$ and using the classifying map $f : M \to B\mathrm{O}(n)\langle k+1\rangle$ to compare the spectral sequence of $P \to M$ with the spectral sequence of the universal bundle, one finds that the generator of $H^k(P_x;\pi_k(\mathrm{O}(n)))$ is mapped by d_k to $f^*\theta_{k+1}$, which is the obstruction to lifting P to an $\mathrm{O}(n)\langle k+1\rangle$-bundle. Furthermore the map d_k fits into an exact sequence

$$0 \to H^k(M;\pi_k(\mathrm{O}(n))) \xrightarrow{\pi^*} H^k(P;\pi_k(\mathrm{O}(n))) \xrightarrow{\iota_x^*} H^k(P_x;\pi_k(\mathrm{O}(n))) \xrightarrow{d_k} H^{k+1}(M;\pi_k(\mathrm{O}(n)))$$

from which one can deduce the following, which collects together and generalizes the corresponding statements from [SSS09] [BS09] [Sa14].

Proposition 8. *The set of isomorphism classes of $\mathrm{O}(n)\langle k+1\rangle$-structures on the $\mathrm{O}(n)\langle k\rangle$-principal bundle $P \to M$ is a torsor for $H^k(M;\pi_k(\mathrm{O}(n)))$.*

Considering the process of rationalization and our discussion surrounding the rational Whitehead tower in Sec. 2.1, we can construct a nice parallel to this story of $\mathrm{O}(n)\langle k\rangle$-structures by considering the rational Whitehead tower over $B\mathrm{O}(n)$. Given a homomorphism of groups $\rho : H \to G$, let $\rho_{\mathbb{Q}} : H_{\mathbb{Q}} \to G_{\mathbb{Q}}$ represent the rationalization of ρ. This in turn induces a morphism of classifying spaces $B\rho_{\mathbb{Q}} : BH_{\mathbb{Q}} \to BG_{\mathbb{Q}}$. Note that, as we have seen in Sec. 2.2, we can think about $BG_{\mathbb{Q}}$ equally via either delooping of H-spaces or via classifying spaces of groups. On the other hand, if we have a principal G-bundle, then the composition of the classifying map $f : M \to BG$ with the rationalization of BG, $\ell_{BG} : BG \to BG_{\mathbb{Q}}$, gives a map $f_{\mathbb{Q}} : M \to BG_{\mathbb{Q}}$. Note that as $B(G_{\mathbb{Q}}) \simeq (BG)_{\mathbb{Q}}$ then, in the context of classifying spaces, there is no ambiguity in using the notation $BG_{\mathbb{Q}}$. In order to pursue the analogy with G-structures as above, we begin with the following definition.

Definition 9. *Given a principal G-bundle $P \to M$, a* rational H-structure *on P is given by a lift of the classifying map $f_{\mathbb{Q}} : M \to BG_{\mathbb{Q}}$ along the map $B\rho_{\mathbb{Q}} : BH_{\mathbb{Q}} \to BG_{\mathbb{Q}}$.*

For our purposes, we specialize this to the case of $\mathrm{O}(n)\langle k\rangle$-structures.

Example 7 (Rational Whitehead tower of $\mathrm{O}(n)$)**.** *Consider the rational Whitehead tower corresponding to the classifying space $B\mathrm{O}(n)$. As the rationalization induces an isomorphism on homotopy groups tensored with $\mathbb{Q}$ and, since the only non-torsion homotopy groups $\pi_i(\mathrm{O}(n))$ occur when $i = 4k-1$, the rational Whitehead tower looks as follows*

$$
\begin{array}{ccccc}
 & & \vdots & & \\
 & & \downarrow & & \\
K(\mathbb{Q},11) & \longrightarrow & B\mathrm{O}(n)\langle 16\rangle_{\mathbb{Q}} = B\mathrm{Ninebrane}(n)_{\mathbb{Q}} & & \\
 & & \downarrow & & \\
K(\mathbb{Q},7) & \longrightarrow & B\mathrm{O}(n)\langle 12\rangle_{\mathbb{Q}} = B\mathrm{Fivebrane}(n)_{\mathbb{Q}} & \xrightarrow{p_3^{\mathbb{Q}}} & K(\mathbb{Q},12) \\
 & & \downarrow & & \\
K(\mathbb{Q},3) & \longrightarrow & B\mathrm{O}(n)\langle 8\rangle_{\mathbb{Q}} = B\mathrm{String}(n)_{\mathbb{Q}} & \xrightarrow{p_2^{\mathbb{Q}}} & K(\mathbb{Q},8) \\
 & & \downarrow & & \\
 & & B\mathrm{O}(n)\langle 4\rangle_{\mathbb{Q}} = B\mathrm{Spin}(n)_{\mathbb{Q}} & \xrightarrow{p_1^{\mathbb{Q}}} & K(\mathbb{Q},4)\,.
\end{array}
$$

The first two homotopy groups of $\mathrm{O}(n)$ are torsion, so that $B\mathrm{O}(n)_{\mathbb{Q}} \simeq B\mathrm{SO}(n)_{\mathbb{Q}} \cong B\mathrm{Spin}(n)_{\mathbb{Q}}$. Similarly, in the next period of the real Bott periodicity, the two homotopy groups of $\mathrm{O}(n)$ in degrees 9 and 10 are torsion, so that (in the notation of [Sa14]*, see also Sec. 3.3) $B2\mathrm{Orient}_{\mathbb{Q}} \simeq B2\mathrm{Spin}(n)_{\mathbb{Q}} \simeq B\mathrm{Ninebrane}(n)_{\mathbb{Q}}$. Note that the obstructions are given a priori by fractions of the indicated Pontrjagin classes. However, since we are working rationally, these are equivalent to the bare classes.*

Once we rationalize, our structures connect to classical constructions.

Example 8. (i) *(Rational String structures). Let G be a compact Lie group and H a closed subgroup. Then the coset space G/H has vanishing $p_1^{\mathbb{Q}}$ provided the Killing form of $\mathfrak{g} = \mathrm{Lie}(G)$ restricts to a multiple of the Killing form of $\mathfrak{h} = \mathrm{Lie}(H)$* [Ba81]*. The same holds if the subgroup H is simple* [Si82]*.*
(ii) *(Rational Fivebrane structures). Manifolds admitting differentiable action of the groups $G = \mathrm{SU}(n)$, $\mathrm{SO}(n)$, or $\mathrm{Sp}(n)$ with vanishing $p_1^{\mathbb{Q}}$ and $p_2^{\mathbb{Q}}$ are studied in* [HH67] [Gr74]*.*
(iii) *(Rational Ninebrane structures). In fact, in* [Si82, Prop. 3.2] *a criterion for constructing quotients G/H with $p_1^{\mathbb{Q}} = p_2^{\mathbb{Q}} = p_3^{\mathbb{Q}}$ is given in terms of the positive roots $\{\beta_i\}_{i=1}^s$ of H. This is the requirement that the sum $\sum_{i=1}^s \beta_i^{2m}$ is contained in the ideal I of the ring $H^*(BH;\mathbb{Q})$ generated by $q^*(\widetilde{H}^*(BG;\mathbb{Q}))$ for $1 \leqslant m \leqslant 3$.*
(iiv) *(Rational Ninebrane structures). Requiring $p_1^{\mathbb{Q}} = p_2^{\mathbb{Q}} = p_3^{\mathbb{Q}}$ for manifolds of dimension at most twelve is equivalent to these being rationally parallelizable. This happens for G/H with H locally isomorphic to $SU(2)$ (see* [Si82, Cor 3.3]*).*

3.2. **Variations on rational Fivebrane classes.** We start by discussing in detail the $n = 8$ case, i.e. when we have a String-principal bundle and wish to investigate when it admits a rational Fivebrane structure. As the space String is 6-connected with $\pi_7(\text{String}) \cong \pi_7(O) \cong \mathbb{Z}$, it follows from the Hurewicz and Universal Coefficients Theorem that $H^7(\text{String}; \mathbb{Q}) \cong \mathbb{Q}$. Tracing what it means for a manifold M to have a Fivebrane structure, we make the following definitions.

Definition 10. *Given a* String*-principal bundle* $\pi_{\text{String}} : P \to M$*, the bundle* P *has a* rational Fivebrane structure *if there is a lift of the rationalized classifying map* $f : M \to B\text{String}_{\mathbb{Q}}$ *to the homotopy fiber* $hofib(\frac{1}{6}p_2^{\mathbb{Q}})$.

Note here that we have chosen to study the homotopy fiber of a representative of $\frac{1}{6}p_2^{\mathbb{Q}}$. As above (see Example 7), we could have chosen to study the homotopy fiber of $p_2^{\mathbb{Q}}$ or even $rp_2^{\mathbb{Q}}$ for any $r \in \mathbb{Q}$, as the resulting classifying spaces are all homotopy equivalent. The only discrepancy here will be that the rational Fivebrane structures will differ by an homotopy equivalence. Thus, up to isomorphism, these structures are the same.

Using the loop space functor, there is a morphism $[X, K(A, n)] \to [\Omega X, \Omega K(A, n)]$ which corresponds to a morphism $H^n(X; A) \to H^{n-1}(\Omega X; A)$. Setting $X = BG$ and identifying $\Omega BG \simeq G$, we obtain the transgression map $\tau : H^*(BG; A) \to H^{*-1}(G; A)$ for any group G. In fact τ is the right inverse for d_n, i.e. $d_n(\tau) = \text{Id}$, where d_n is the cohomological transgression arising from the nth page of the Serre spectral sequence of a fibration. Setting $a_7 \in H^7(\text{String}; \mathbb{Q})$ to be the generator given by $a_7 := \tau(\frac{1}{6}p_2^{\mathbb{Q}})$, we make the following definition.

Definition 11. *A* rational Fivebrane structure class *is a cohomology class* $\mathcal{F} \in H^7(P; \mathbb{Q})$ *such that* $\iota_x^*\mathcal{F} = a_7 \in H^7(\text{String}; \mathbb{Q})$ *for each fiber inclusion* $\iota_x : \text{String} \to P$.

As with the integral case [SSS09], it follows that these rational Fivebrane structure classes form a torsor for $H^7(M; \mathbb{Q})$. Furthermore, the case of finite rank can be treated similarly, taking into account the discussions in Sec. 2.4.

At this stage, our goal is to describe higher structures (beyond Spin) using Spin structures to the extent of which it is possible. We will do this here for Fivebrane and in the next section for Ninebrane structures.

Lemma 12. *The map* $\rho : \text{String} \to \text{Spin}$ *induces an isomorphism* $\rho^* : H^7(\text{Spin}; \mathbb{Q}) \xrightarrow{\cong} H^7(\text{String}; \mathbb{Q})$.

We have defined rational Fivebrane classes solely as any class in $H^7(P; \mathbb{Q})$ which restricts to a certain generator in $H^7(\text{String}; \mathbb{Q})$. We make two notes regarding this. The first is that the transgression map is invariant under rationalization. Thus if we have a generator $\frac{1}{6}p_2 \in H^8(B\text{String}; \mathbb{Z})$, then $(\frac{1}{6}p_2)^{\mathbb{Q}}$ is a generator for $H^8(B\text{String}; \mathbb{Q})$. More importantly, we have $\tau((\frac{1}{6}p_2)^{\mathbb{Q}}) = (\tau(\frac{1}{6}p_2))^{\mathbb{Q}}$. The consequence of this is the following.

Lemma 13. *The rationalization of any Fivebrane class is a rational Fivebrane class.*

Proof. Every Fivebrane class $\mathcal{F} \in H^7(P; \mathbb{Z})$ satisfies $\iota_x^*\mathcal{F} = \tau(\frac{1}{6}p_2)$. Then, by naturality of rationalization and what we noted above, the rational class $\mathcal{F}_{\mathbb{Q}}$ satisfies

$$\iota_x^*\mathcal{F}_{\mathbb{Q}} = (\iota_x^*\mathcal{F})_{\mathbb{Q}} = (\tau(\tfrac{1}{6}p_2))_{\mathbb{Q}} = a_7 \ .$$

Hence $\mathcal{F}_{\mathbb{Q}}$ is a rational Fivebrane class. □

Thus for any ordinary Fivebrane class, there is a corresponding rational Fivebrane class. The second thing we note is that with the isomorphism from Lemma 12, we can define a generator of $H^7(\text{Spin}; \mathbb{Q})$ as

$(\rho^*)^{-1}(\tau(\frac{1}{6}p_2))$. For simplicity we will denote this class as $\tilde{a}_7$. We will also set $a_3 := \tau((\frac{1}{2}p_1)^{\mathbb{Q}}) \in H^3(\mathrm{Spin};\mathbb{Q})$. Consequently, by considering the underlying Spin bundle for our String bundle, we can define classes here similar to how Fivebrane classes are defined cohomologically.

To that end, let $\pi_{\mathrm{Spin}} : Q \to M$ denote the underlying Spin bundle.

Definition 14. *A* rational Spin-Fivebrane class *is a cohomology class $\mathcal{F}_{\mathbb{Q}}$ in $H^7(Q;\mathbb{Q})$ such that $\iota_x^*\mathcal{F}_{\mathbb{Q}} = \tilde{a}_7 \in H^7(\mathrm{Spin};\mathbb{Q})$ for each $x \in M$.*

In the absence of a rational String structure, or more precisely if the obstruction $p_1^{\mathbb{Q}}$ for rational String structures does not vanish, then the concept of a rational Spin-Fivebrane structure is equivalent to a rational p_2-structure. In other words we have the following.

Corollary 15. *If $p_1^{\mathbb{Q}} \neq 0 \in H^4(M;\mathbb{Q})$, then the set of rational Spin-Fivebrane classes classifies rational $p_2^{\mathbb{Q}}$-structures up to isomorphism.*

The main question we pursue now is how the two definitions, Def. 11 and Def. 14, are related. It is not too difficult to show that every rational Spin-Fivebrane class gets mapped by ρ^* to a rational Fivebrane class; however we can say more.

Theorem 16. **(i)** *For every rational Spin-Fivebrane class $\mathcal{F} \in H^7(Q;\mathbb{Q})$, the pullback $\rho^*\mathcal{F}$ is a rational Fivebrane class.*
(ii) *For any rational* Fivebrane *structure $\mathcal{F} \in H^7(P;\mathbb{Q})$ there is a Spin-Fivebrane class $\tilde{\mathcal{F}} \in H^7(Q;\mathbb{Q})$ such that $\rho^*\tilde{\mathcal{F}} = \mathcal{F}$.*
(iii) *Two classes $\mathcal{F}$, $\mathcal{F}' \in H^7(Q;\mathbb{Q})$ will give the same Fivebrane structure if $\mathcal{F} - \mathcal{F}' = \mathcal{S} \cdot \pi_{\mathrm{Spin}}^*\phi_4$ where $\mathcal{S} \in H^3(Q;\mathbb{Q})$ is the String structure class and $\phi_4 \in H^4(M;\mathbb{Q})$ is a rational cohomology class.*

Proof. The main ingredient that will be used in the proof is the corresponding Serre spectral sequences for the bundles Q and P along with the spectral sequences for the universal bundles over the classifying spaces $B\mathrm{Spin}$ and $B\mathrm{String}$. Let f_{Spin} and f_{String} be the classifying map of Q and P respectively. The second page of the spectral sequence for Q is as follows



As the spectral sequence converges to the cohomology of the total space and as are coefficients are $\mathbb{Q}$, it follows that we have a non-canonical splitting

$$H^7(Q;\mathbb{Q}) \cong E_\infty^{7,0} \oplus E_\infty^{4,3} \oplus E_\infty^{0,7}.$$

Thus we want to calculate each of these terms. On $E_\infty^{7,0}$, we have that the differentials d_r are all zero since $E_r^{p,q} = 0$ for $q < 0$. Thus the only differential of interest is $d_4 : E_4^{3,3} \to E_4^{7,0}$. Let us determine

how the differential acts on generators of $E_4^{3,3}$. Using that $E_4^{3,3} \cong E_2^{3,3} \cong \mathbb{Q}[a_3] \otimes H^3(M)$, then a typical generator is of the form $a_3\omega_3$ where $\omega_3 \in H^3(M;\mathbb{Q})$. We also know that $d_4(a_3) = kp_1$ where p_1 is the first Pontrjagin class of M and k is a scalar, and since M admits a String structure, then $p_1 = 0$. Thus $d_4(a_3\omega_3) = kp_1\omega_3 + a_3 d_4(\omega) = 0$ for any generator of $E_4^{3,3}$ and thus $E_\infty^{7,0} = H^7(M;\mathbb{Q})$.

For $E_\infty^{0,7}$, the only relevant differentials are $d_5 : E_5^{0,7} \to E_5^{5,3}$ and $d_8 : E_8^{0,7} \to E_8^{8,0}$. Since d_r is zero for $r \leqslant 4$ and $6 \leqslant r < 8$, then it follows that $E_5^{0,7} \cong \mathbb{Q}[a_7]$. To see what d_5 and d_8 map $\mathbb{R}[a_7]$ to, we will use the spectral sequence for the universal bundle $\mathrm{Spin}(n) \to E\mathrm{Spin} \to B\mathrm{Spin}$ along with naturality of the bundle map coming from the classifying map $f : M \to B\mathrm{Spin}$. Let $F_r^{p,q}$ represent the spectral sequence for the universal bundle. Then the map $f : M \to B\mathrm{Spin}$ induces maps $f^* : F_r^{p,q} \to E_r^{p,q}$ such that f^* is the identity when $p = 0$. Thus $d_5(a_7) = d_5(f^*a_7) = f^*d_5(a_7) = 0$ since $H^5(B\mathrm{Spin};\mathbb{Q}) = 0$ which means $F_*^{5,3} = 0$. By the same reasoning, since d_8 maps a_7 to the generator of $H^8(B\mathrm{Spin};\mathbb{Q})$ then for Q, $d_8(a_7) = kp_2$ where p_2 is the second Pontrjagin class and k is some scalar. Since Q has a Fivebrane structure, then $d_8(a_7) = 0$ and thus $E_\infty^{0,7} = E_2^{0,7} \cong \mathbb{R}[a_7]$. It follows that

$$H^7(Q;\mathbb{Q}) \cong \mathbb{Q}[a_7] \oplus E_\infty^{4,3} \oplus H^7(M;\mathbb{Q}).$$

Through a similar argument, we find that $H^7(P;\mathbb{Q}) \cong \mathbb{Q}[a_7] \oplus H^7(M;\mathbb{Q})$ where we now have $E_\infty^{4,3} = 0$ since $H^3(\mathrm{String};\mathbb{Q}) = 0$. The bundle morphism $\mu : P \to Q$ induces a homomorphism $\mu^* : H^7(Q;\mathbb{Q}) \to H^7(P;\mathbb{Q})$ and thus a homomorphism between each page of the spectral sequences. It follows that μ^* is surjective, and that $\mathrm{Ker}(\mu^*) = E_\infty^{4,3}$. To finish the proof, it only remains for us to show that $E_\infty^{4,3} \cong \mathbb{Q}[a_3] \otimes H^4(M;\mathbb{Q})$. Indeed, the only nontrivial differential is $d_4 : E_4^{4,3} \to E_4^{8,0}$ and since we have already shown that $d_4(a_3) = 0$ then it follows that d_4 is also trivial. □

Remark 4. **(i)** *Theorem 16 demonstrates the degree to which the underlying Spin bundle can be used to classify lifts of the String bundles rationally. The difference between the integral and rational case is torsion and the Bockstein sequence corresponding to the short exact sequence* $1 \to \mathbb{Z} \to \mathbb{Q} \to \mathbb{Q}/\mathbb{Z} \to 1$ *prescribes to what degree that they differ. Thus two Fivebrane structures are identified rationally if their difference corresponds to a torsion class in* $H^7(M;\mathbb{Z})$.
(ii) *Theorem 16, furthermore, gives us a similar understanding of what happens when going from Spin-Fivebrane to Fivebrane classes rationally. Part 1 tells us that every rational Spin-Fivebrane class corresponds to a rational Fivebrane class. Part 2 identifies when any two rational Spin-Fivebrane classes correspond to the same rational Fivebrane class.*

This says that rationally all the information on Fivebrane structures is essentially encoded in the underlying Spin bundles. In fact, it follows immediately that we have

Corollary 17. *If* $H^4(M;\mathbb{Q})$ *is torsion, then the set of Fivebrane classes and Spin-Fivebrane classes are in bijective correspondence.*

Settings where this occurs include the following.

Example 9. **(i)** *The Witten manifolds* $M_{k,\ell}$*, which are* S^1 *bundles over the product of complex projective spaces* $\mathbb{C}P^2 \times \mathbb{C}P^1$*, are classified in* [KS88] *according to two integers* k *and* ℓ*. They have* $H^4(M_{k,\ell};\mathbb{Z}) = \mathbb{Z}/\ell^2$.
(ii) *Generalized Witten manifolds* N_{kl} *are defined as the total spaces of fiber bundles with fiber the lens space* $L_k(\ell_2,\ell_2)$ *and structure group* S^1*. They have* $H^4(N_{kl};\mathbb{Z}) \cong \mathbb{Z}_{|\ell_1\ell_2|}$ [Es05].
(iii) Quaternionic line bundles E *over closed Spin manifolds of dimension* $4k-1$ *with* $c_2(E) \in H^4(M)$ *been torsion considered in* [CG13] *via generalizations of the Kreck-Stolz invariants.*

3.3. **Variations on rational Ninebrane classes.** We now extend the results from the last section to the next higher connected cover of the orthogonal group O. Following [Sa14], let 2Spin and Ninebrane denote the groups $\mathrm{O}\langle 10\rangle$ and $\mathrm{O}\langle 14\rangle$ respectively. Notice that in our Whitehead tower $B\mathrm{O}\langle k\rangle$ for $k = 9, 11$ is obtained by killing homotopy groups that are completely torsion. Hence rationally, $H^*(B\mathrm{O}\langle k\rangle; \mathbb{Q}) \cong H^*(2\mathrm{Spin}; \mathbb{Q})$ for $k = 8, 9$. So to follow along the lines of rational Fivebrane structures, we may define rational Ninebrane structures, and so on, for all the n-connected covers of O which correspond to the killing of integral homotopy groups.

Definition 18. *A* 2Spin*-principal bundle* $\pi_{_{2\mathrm{Spin}}} : T \to M$ *admits a* rational Ninebrane structure *if there is a lift of the rational classifying map* $f : M \to B2\mathrm{Spin}_{\mathbb{Q}}$ *to the homotopy fiber* $F(\frac{1}{240}p_3)^{\mathbb{Q}}$.

Definition 19. *A* rational Ninebrane class *is a cohomology class* $\mathcal{N}_{\mathbb{Q}} \in H^{11}(T; \mathbb{Q})$ *such that* $\iota_x^*\mathcal{N} = a_{11} \in H^{11}(2\mathrm{Spin}; \mathbb{Q})$ *for each inclusion* $\iota_x : 2\mathrm{Spin} \to T$.

Now, just as we did in the case of Fivebrane structures, we will relate these classes to ones on the underlying Spin bundle. In order to do this, as we compared degree 7 rational cohomology between Spin and String we need to compare the degree 11 rational cohomology of Spin and 2Spin.

Lemma 20. *The map* $\rho : 2\mathrm{Spin} \to \mathrm{Spin}$ *induces an isomorphism* $\rho^* : H^{11}(\mathrm{Spin}; \mathbb{Q}) \xrightarrow{\cong} H^{11}(2\mathrm{Spin}; \mathbb{Q})$.

Proof. The first thing to notice is that, as $\pi_n(\mathrm{O}) \cong \mathbb{Z}_2$ for $n = 0, 1 \pmod 8$, it follows that $\mathrm{O}\langle 8\rangle$ and 2Spin each arise from killing a homotopy class with $\mathbb{Z}_2$ torsion. Thus, by the Leray-Hirsch Theorem, we have $H^*(\mathrm{Fivebrane}; \mathbb{Q}) \cong H^*(\mathrm{O}\langle 8\rangle; \mathbb{Q}) \cong H^*(2\mathrm{Spin}; \mathbb{Q})$ since $H^*(K(\mathbb{Z}_2, n); \mathbb{Q}) = 0$. Now, using the following fibrations

$$\mathrm{Fivebrane} \longrightarrow \mathrm{String} \longrightarrow K(\mathbb{Z}, 7)\,, \qquad K(\mathbb{Z}, 2) \longrightarrow \mathrm{String} \longrightarrow \mathrm{Spin}\,,$$

we look at the corresponding Serre Spectral sequences. For the first fibration, as $H^k(\mathrm{Fivebrane}; \mathbb{Q}) = 0$ for $k \leqslant 10$, then it follows that $E^{p,q} = 0$ for $q \leqslant 10$. Hence

$$H^{11}(\mathrm{String}; \mathbb{Q}) \cong \bigoplus_{p+q=11} E_\infty^{p,q} = E_\infty^{0,11} = E_2^{0,11} \cong H^{11}(\mathrm{Fivebrane}(n); \mathbb{Q}).$$

Finally, for the second fibration, the second page of our spectral sequence is as follows:



Now $H^{11}(\mathrm{String}; \mathbb{Q}) \cong \bigoplus_{p+q=11} E_\infty^{p,q} = E_\infty^{11,0} \oplus E_\infty^{10,1} \oplus E_\infty^{7,4} \oplus E_\infty^{3,8} \oplus E_\infty^{0,11}$. Also note that as $H^3(\mathrm{String}; \mathbb{Q}) = 0$, then the differential $d_3 : E_3^{0,2} \to E_3^{0,3}$ is an isomorphism and thus $d_3(x^n) = nx^{n-1}a_3$. Consequently d_3 is an isomorphism between the zeroth and third columns, and hence it follows that $E_\infty^{0,q} = E^{3,q} = 0$ for every $q > 0$. Furthermore we have $d_3(a_7x^2) = 2a_3a_7x \neq 0$ and thus $E_\infty^{7,4} = 0$. Therefore it follows that $H^{11}(\mathrm{String}; \mathbb{Q}) \cong E_\infty^{11,0} \cong H^{11}(\mathrm{Spin}; \mathbb{Q})$. □

Now we can use Lemma 20 to relate rational Ninebrane classes to classes on the underlying Spin bundle.

Definition 21. *A* rational Spin-Ninebrane class *is a cohomology class* $\mathcal{N}_{\mathbb{Q}}$ *in* $H^{11}(Q;\mathbb{Q})$ *such that* $\iota_x^*\mathcal{N}_{\mathbb{Q}} = \tilde{a}_{11} \in H^{11}(\mathrm{Spin};\mathbb{Q})$ *for each* $x \in M$.

We characterize these new classes as follows.

Theorem 22. **(i)** *For every rational Spin-Ninebrane class* $\mathcal{N}_{\mathbb{Q}} \in H^{11}(Q;\mathbb{Q})$*, the pullback* $\rho^*\mathcal{N}_{\mathbb{Q}}$ *is a rational Fivebrane class.*
(ii) *Any rational Ninebrane structure* $\mathcal{N}_{\mathbb{Q}} \in H^{11}(T;\mathbb{Q})$ *can be described by a class in* $H^{11}(Q;\mathbb{Q})$.
(iii) *Two classes* $\mathcal{N}_{\mathbb{Q}}, \mathcal{N}'_{\mathbb{Q}} \in H^{11}(Q;\mathbb{Q})$ *will give the same rational Ninebrane structure if*

$$\mathcal{N}_{\mathbb{Q}} - \mathcal{N}'_{\mathbb{Q}} = \mathcal{S} \cdot \pi^*_{\mathrm{Spin}}\psi_8 + \mathcal{F} \cdot \pi^*_{\mathrm{Spin}}\phi_4 \ ,$$

where $\mathcal{S} \in H^3(Q;\mathbb{Q})$ *is the String structure class,* $\mathcal{F} \in H^7(Q;\mathbb{Q})$ *is the Fivebrane structure class,* $\psi_8 \in H^8(M;\mathbb{Q})$*, and* $\phi_4 \in H^4(M;\mathbb{Q})$ *are rational cohomology classes.*

Proof. The proof follows along similar lines as the proof of Theorem 16. Given a 2Spin-bundle T over a manifold M, we have an induced Spin-bundle over M, by Lemma 20, induced by the fibration $\rho : 2\mathrm{Spin} \to \mathrm{Spin}$. By Lemma 20, we also know that this fibration induces an isomorphism on rational cohomology of degree 11. In keeping with our notation, we will denote this induced Spin bundle as Q. Now as before, we will compare the Serre spectral sequences corresponding to the rational cohomology for both bundles. As $H^k(2\mathrm{Spin};\mathbb{Q}) = 0$ for $0 < k < 11$, it follows easily that $H^{11}(T;\mathbb{Q}) = \mathbb{Q}[a_{11}] \oplus H^{11}(M;\mathbb{Q})$. Now for the bundle Q, the second page of the Serre spectral sequence is provided below.

We would like to calculate the entries $E_\infty^{p,q}$ such that $p + q = 11$. It follows immediately that $E_\infty^{1,10} = E_\infty^{2,9} = E_\infty^{3,8} = E_\infty^{5,6} = E_\infty^{6,5} = E_\infty^{7,4} = E_\infty^{9,2} = E_\infty^{10,1} = 0$. Thus

$$H^{11}(T;\mathbb{Q}) \cong E_\infty^{11,0} \oplus E_\infty^{7,4} \oplus E_\infty^{3,8} \oplus E_\infty^{0,11}.$$

On inspection of the universal Spin bundle, we find that $d_4(\tilde{a}_3) = b_4$, $d_8(\tilde{a}_7) = b_8$, and $d_{12}(\tilde{a}_{11}) = b_{12}$, where $b_i \in H^i(B\mathrm{Spin};\mathbb{Q})$ and $\tilde{a}_i \in H^i(B\mathrm{Spin};\mathbb{Q})$ are generators. We also find that for all other possible differentials, $d_r(a_i) = 0$. Using functoriality of the differential maps and using the classifying map of Q to compare with the universal Spin bundle, it follows that $d_r(a_3) = 0$ for $r \neq 4$, $d_r(a_7) = 0$ for $r \neq 8$, and $d_r(a_{11}) = 0$ for $r \neq 12$.



Then we may proceed along the same lines as in Theorem 16 to identify the following pages

$$E_\infty^{11,0} \cong \mathbb{Q}[a_{11}] \,, \qquad E_\infty^{7,4} \cong \mathbb{Q}[a_7] \otimes H^4(M;\mathbb{Q}) \,,$$
$$E_\infty^{0,11} \cong H^{11}(M;\mathbb{Q}) \,, \qquad E_\infty^{3,8} \cong \mathbb{Q}[a_3] \otimes H^8(M;\mathbb{Q}) \,,$$

from which the theorem follows. □

Remark 5. *This theorem shows again that for Ninebrane structures most of the information is rationally encoded in the underlying Spin bundle. While the kernel of the map which assigns rational Spin-Ninebrane classes to rational Ninebrane classes is larger, we still have a surjection. In fact, this process should extend further to higher structures. The reason is that we are making use of the fact that, rationally, there is an isomorphism*

$$H^{12}(B\mathrm{Spin};\mathbb{Q})/(p_1^{\mathbb{Q}}, p_2^{\mathbb{Q}}) \cong H^{12}(B2\mathrm{Spin};\mathbb{Q}) \,.$$

Through minimal models (see Sec. 2.3), it becomes clear that isomorphisms such as these continue to occur for higher connected covers of Spin*. The difficulty in extending this definition then becomes more of a problem with determining the kernel of these maps.*

Again, we have the following.

Corollary 23. *If $H^4(M;\mathbb{Z})$ and $H^8(M;\mathbb{Z})$ are pure torsion, then the set of Ninebrane classes and Spin-Ninebrane classes are in bijective correspondence.*

Example 10. *We can give a nontrivial example of a manifold X which has torsion $H^4(X;\mathbb{Z})$, vanishing $H^8(X;\mathbb{Z})$ and non-torsion $H^{12}(X;\mathbb{Z})$. Let* SU(2) *be the subgroup of* SU(4) *consisting of all block diagonal matrices* $\mathrm{diag}(A, A)$ *where $A \in \mathrm{SU}(2)$. Then the 12-dimensional quotient $X = \mathrm{SU}(4)/\mathrm{SU}(2)$, viewed as the base of an S^3 bundle, is stably parallelizable with $H^4(X;\mathbb{Z}) = \mathbb{Z}_2$, $H^8(X;\mathbb{Z}) = 0$ and $H^{12}(X;\mathbb{Z}) = \mathbb{Z}$* [Si82, Lemma 6.5].

3.4. **Gauge transformations.** We now consider automorphisms of bundles equipped with the structures that we have just defined above. Let G be a topological group and $G \to P \xrightarrow{\xi} X$ be a continuous G-principal bundle. Let $\mathcal{G}(\xi)$ be the gauge group of ξ, i.e. the group of bundle automorphisms of P. An element $\eta \in \mathcal{G}(P)$ is a bundle isomorphism of P that fits into the diagram (see e.g. [Co98])

$$\begin{array}{ccc} P & \xrightarrow{\eta} & P \\ \downarrow & \cong & \downarrow \\ X & \xrightarrow{=} & X \,. \end{array}$$

Equivalently, $\mathcal{G}(P)$ is the group $\mathcal{P} = \mathrm{Aut}_G(P)$ of G-equivariant homeomorphisms of P. If P is the trivial bundle $X \times G \to X$ then $\mathcal{G}(P)$ is given by the function space from X to G, i.e. $\mathcal{G}(P) \cong \mathrm{Map}(X, G)$. One can also consider the based gauge group $\mathcal{G}_0(P)$, which is a subgroup of $\mathcal{P}$ which fix the fiber P_x pointwise, i.e.

$$\mathcal{G}_0(P) = \{\eta \in \mathcal{G}(P) \mid \text{if } p \in P_{x_0} \text{ then } \eta(p) = p\} \,.$$

In relation to Fivebrane and Spin-Fivebrane classes, we consider in general a principal $\mathrm{O}\langle k\rangle$-bundle and the maps to be homotopy equivalences rather than homeomorphisms. In the case where the structure group of this bundle lifts to $\mathrm{O}\langle k+1\rangle$ then, as noted above in Sec. 3.2, these lifts are classified up to homotopy by classes in $H^k(P;\pi_k(\mathrm{O})$ which pull back under the fiber inclusion map $\iota_x : P_x \to P$, for every $x \in X$, to the class corresponding to a chosen generator of $H^k(\mathrm{O}\langle k\rangle;\pi_k(\mathrm{O}))$. As gauge transformations describe homotopy equivalences of the total space, the induced morphisms on cohomology are isomorphisms. Gauge transformations in the based gauge group fix the fiber over the basepoint of X. Thus for $\eta \in \mathcal{G}_0(P)$, we have

$\eta^*\iota_{x_0}^* = \iota_{x_0}^*$. Fixing an element in $H^*(P;\pi_k(\mathrm{O}))$, we can view the pullback ι_x^* as a continuous assignment of a cohomology class in the fiber to each element $x \in X$. Consequently, the based gauge group $\mathcal{G}_0$ consists of those gauge transformations that fix $\mathrm{O}\langle k\rangle$-classes.

Proposition 24. *The unbased and based gauge groups of a* $\mathrm{Spin}\langle n\rangle(m)_{\mathbb{Q}}$ *bundle over* X *are given by the mapping spaces*

$$\mathcal{G} \simeq \mathrm{Map}(X, \Pi_i K(\mathbb{Q}, m_i)) \ , \qquad \mathcal{G}_0 \simeq \mathrm{Map}_*(X, \Pi_i K(\mathbb{Q}, m_i)) \ .$$

Proof. This follows from various classical results in the literature as well as our earlier discussion in Sec. 2.2. Since all of our connected cover groups are rationally abelian, this means that the gauge groups, which are G-equivariant maps, become simply just maps, i.e. $\mathcal{G} = \mathrm{Map}(X, G)$. Alternatively, the same holds, by [FO09, Cor 2.2], since all components of $\mathrm{Map}(X, BG)$ have the same homotopy type. Now we use the fact that $G = \Pi K(\mathbb{Q}, m_i)$ (see Prop. 3). A similar discussion holds for the based case. Note that this does not require any finiteness conditions on X. □

Note that the gauge groups arise as fulll spaces of maps rather than homotopy classes of maps, in which case the gauge group would have been some combination of cohomology classes. We will unpack some of these mapping spaces in order to appreciate the rich structure. We will first consider the more familiar $\mathrm{Spin}_{\mathbb{Q}}$ gauge transformations and ask whether they lift to $\mathrm{String}_{\mathbb{Q}}$ gauge transformations. Tooth end, consider the fibration $K(\mathbb{Q}, 2) \to \mathrm{String}_{\mathbb{Q}} \xrightarrow{p} \mathrm{Spin}_{\mathbb{Q}}$ and the corresponding lift



Hence we would like to consider the decomposition of the mapping space $\mathrm{Map}_u(X, \mathrm{String}_{\mathbb{Q}})$. We define the mapping space $\mathrm{Map}_u(X; \mathrm{String}_{\mathbb{Q}}, \mathrm{Spin}_{\mathbb{Q}})$ to be the space of all maps $f : X \to \mathrm{String}$ such that $p \circ f = u_1$. The fibration $u_1^*(p)$ is a fiber homotpically trivial fibration [Th57]. Then $\mathrm{Map}_u(X, \mathrm{String}_{\mathbb{Q}}, \mathrm{Spin}_{\mathbb{Q}}) = \mathrm{Map}_u(X, K(\mathbb{Q}, 2))$ for some map $u' : X \to K(\mathbb{Q}, 2)$, as $\mathrm{Map}_u(X; \mathrm{String}_{\mathbb{Q}}, \mathrm{Spin}_{\mathbb{Q}})$ can be interpreted as a space of sections of $u_1^*(p)$, as in [Mø87]. Then, from [Ha82] [Ha81] [Th57], we have the equivalence

$$\mathrm{Map}_u(X; \mathrm{String}_{\mathbb{Q}}, \mathrm{Spin}_{\mathbb{Q}}) \simeq \prod_{i=0}^{2} K(H^{2-i}(X;\mathbb{Q}), i) \ .$$

This then implies the following characterization of those gauge transformations that lift.

Proposition 25. *If* X *is 1-connected then* $\mathrm{Map}_u(X, \mathrm{String}_{\mathbb{Q}}, \mathrm{Spin}_{\mathbb{Q}}) \cong H^2(X;\mathbb{Q}) \times K(\mathbb{Q}, 2)$.

Example 11. *For* S^2 *we have* $\mathrm{Map}_u(S^2; \mathrm{String}_{\mathbb{Q}}, \mathrm{Spin}_{\mathbb{Q}}) = K(\mathbb{Q}, 0) \times K(\mathbb{Q}, 2)$*, while for* S^m*,* $m > 2$ *we have* $\mathrm{Map}_u(S^m, \mathrm{String}_{\mathbb{Q}}, \mathrm{Spin}_{\mathbb{Q}}) = K(\mathbb{Q}, 2)$.

We can similarly consider the next two fibrations $K(\mathbb{Q}, 6) \to \mathrm{Fivebrane}_{\mathbb{Q}} \to \mathrm{String}_Q$ and $K(\mathbb{Q}, 10) \to \mathrm{Ninebrane}_{\mathbb{Q}} \to \mathrm{Fivebrane}_Q$. In these cases, the results in [Ha82] [Ha81] [Th57] lead us to

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{Map}_u(X; \mathrm{Fivebrane}_{\mathbb{Q}}, \mathrm{String}_{\mathbb{Q}}) &\simeq \prod_{i=0}^{6} K(H^{6-i}(X;\mathbb{Q}), i) \ . \\ \mathrm{Map}_u(X; \mathrm{Ninebrane}_{\mathbb{Q}}, \mathrm{Fivebrane}_{\mathbb{Q}}) &\simeq \prod_{i=0}^{10} K(H^{10-i}(X;\mathbb{Q}), i) \ . \end{aligned}$$

These are considerable spaces to deal with in practice and in applications. Nevertheless, we can get something tractable upon imposing some conditions.

Proposition 26. **(i)** *If X is 5-connected or if $H^i(X;\mathbb{Z})$, $i \leqslant 5$ is pure torsion, then the rational String gauge transformations that lift to Fivebrane are given as* $\mathrm{Map}_u(X, \mathrm{Fivebrane}_{\mathbb{Q}}, \mathrm{String}_{\mathbb{Q}}) \cong H^6(X;\mathbb{Q})$.
(ii) *If X is 9-connected or if $H^i(X;\mathbb{Z})$, $i \leqslant 9$ is pure torsion, then the rational Fivebrane gauge transformations that lift to Ninebrane are given as* $\mathrm{Map}_u(X, \mathrm{Ninebrane}_{\mathbb{Q}}, \mathrm{Fivebrane}_{\mathbb{Q}}) \cong H^{10}(X;\mathbb{Q})$.

Example 12. *The String to Fivebrane gauge transformations for the case of S^m for $m \geqslant 7$ are given as $K(\mathbb{Q},6)$, while for S^6 they are $K(\mathbb{Q},0)\times K(\mathbb{Q},6)$. Similarly, the Fivebrane to Ninebrane gauge transformations for the case of S^m for $m \geqslant 11$ are given as $K(\mathbb{Q},10)$, while for S^{10} they are $K(\mathbb{Q},0) \times K(\mathbb{Q},10)$.*

In terms of classifying spaces, we can consider the fibration $K(\mathbb{Q},3) \to B\mathrm{String}_{\mathbb{Q}} \xrightarrow{Bp} B\mathrm{Spin}_{\mathbb{Q}}$. Given a principal $\mathrm{String}_{\mathbb{Q}}$-bundle, we can consider its classifying map $f : X \to B\mathrm{String}_{\mathbb{Q}}$. Then the mapping space $\mathrm{Map}_f(X; B\mathrm{String}_{\mathbb{Q}}, B\mathrm{Spin}_{\mathbb{Q}})$ describes the space of all maps from X to $B\mathrm{String}_{\mathbb{Q}}$ which lift the map $Bp \circ f : X \to B\mathrm{Spin}_{\mathbb{Q}}$, and we have

$$\mathrm{Map}_u(X; B\mathrm{String}_{\mathbb{Q}}, B\mathrm{Spin}_{\mathbb{Q}}) \simeq \prod_{i=0}^{3} K(H^{3-i}(X;\mathbb{Q}), i) \ .$$

Similarly we can again consider the fibrations related to $\mathrm{Fivebrane}_{\mathbb{Q}}$ and $\mathrm{Ninebrane}_{\mathbb{Q}}$ as above to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{Map}_u(X; B\mathrm{Fivebrane}_{\mathbb{Q}}, B\mathrm{String}_{\mathbb{Q}}) &\simeq \prod_{i=0}^{7} K(H^{7-i}(X;\mathbb{Q}), i) \ . \\ \mathrm{Map}_u(X; B\mathrm{Ninebrane}, B\mathrm{Fivebrane}) &\simeq \prod_{i=0}^{11} K(H^{11-i}(X;\mathbb{Q}), i) \ . \end{aligned}$$

In general, we can consider the set of lifts for a principal $\mathrm{O}\langle k-1\rangle$-bundle to a principal $\mathrm{O}\langle k\rangle$-bundle. We have fibrations $K(\mathbb{Q},k) \to B\mathrm{O}_{\mathbb{Q}}\langle k+1\rangle \to B\mathrm{O}_{\mathbb{Q}}\langle k\rangle$. Then, using the fact that the fibrations associated with gauge transformations can be extended of classifying spaces [FO09], we have the following.

Proposition 27. *The universal $B\mathrm{O}\langle k\rangle_{\mathbb{Q}}$ gauge transformations which lift to universal $B\mathrm{O}\langle k+1\rangle_{\mathbb{Q}}$ transformations are given by the space*

$$\mathrm{Map}_u(X; B\mathrm{O}\langle k+1\rangle_{\mathbb{Q}}, B\mathrm{O}\langle k\rangle_{\mathbb{Q}}) \simeq \prod_{i=0}^{k} K(H^{k-i}(X;\mathbb{Q}), i) \ .$$

Recall Proposition 8 which established that the set of isomorphism classes of $\mathrm{O}\langle k+1\rangle$-structures is a torsor for $H^k(X;\pi_k(\mathrm{O}))$. For rational structures, this Proposition still holds where now the set of isomorphims classes of $\mathrm{O}_{\mathbb{Q}}\langle k+1\rangle$-structures is a torsor for $H^k(X;\mathbb{Q})$. Now as isomorphic bundles have homotopic classifying maps, then we can equivalently interpret the set of isomorphism classes of $\mathrm{O}\langle k+1\rangle$-structures lifting an $\mathrm{O}\langle k\rangle$ bundle as the connected components π_0 of $\mathrm{Map}_u(X; B\mathrm{O}\langle k+1\rangle_{\mathbb{Q}}, B\mathrm{O}\langle k\rangle_{\mathbb{Q}})$. Using the homotopy equivalence of Prop. 27, we can explicitly calculate to find

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_0\big(\mathrm{Map}_u(X; B\mathrm{O}\langle k+1\rangle_{\mathbb{Q}}, B\mathrm{O}\langle k\rangle_{\mathbb{Q}}\big) &\cong \pi_0\big(\prod_{i=0}^{k} K(H^{k-i}(X;\mathbb{Q}), i)\big) \\ &\cong H^k(X;\mathbb{Q}) \ . \end{aligned}$$

This agrees with Proposition 8.

Remark 6. **(i)** *In relation to our previous discussion on rational* Spin-Fivebrane *structures in Sec. 3.2, we considered the problem of classifying* Fivebrane *structures on a principal* String*-bundle by classes on the underlying* Spin*-bundle. Following along this theme, we again consider a principal* $\mathrm{String}_{\mathbb{Q}}$*-bundle and its underlying* $\mathrm{Spin}_{\mathbb{Q}}$*-bundle, and we consider the maps $p' : \mathrm{Fivebrane}_{\mathbb{Q}} \to \mathrm{String}_{\mathbb{Q}}$ and $p : \mathrm{String}_{\mathbb{Q}} \to \mathrm{Spin}_{\mathbb{Q}}$.*

Then we have the classifying map $f : X \to B\mathrm{String}_{\mathbb{Q}}$ and composition with Bp gives the classifying map for the principal $\mathrm{Spin}_{\mathbb{Q}}$-bundle. Suppose further that the classifying map f lifts along Bp' to a map $\tilde{f} : X \to B\mathrm{Fivebrane}_{\mathbb{Q}}$. Then the space $\mathrm{Map}_{\tilde{f}}(X; B\mathrm{Fivebrane}_{\mathbb{Q}}, B\mathrm{Spin}_{\mathbb{Q}})$ represents liftings of the underlying $\mathrm{Spin}_{\mathbb{Q}}$-bundle to a $\mathrm{Fivebrane}_{\mathbb{Q}}$ structure. Following from [Mø87]*, there is a fibration*

$$\mathrm{Map}_{\tilde{f}}(X; B\mathrm{Fivebrane}_{\mathbb{Q}}, B\mathrm{String}_{\mathbb{Q}}) \to \mathrm{Map}_{\tilde{f}}(X; B\mathrm{Fivebrane}_{\mathbb{Q}}, B\mathrm{Spin}_{\mathbb{Q}}) \to \mathrm{Map}_{f}(X; B\mathrm{String}_{\mathbb{Q}}, B\mathrm{Spin}_{\mathbb{Q}})$$

(ii) *Similary we consider what happens with gauge transformations. Let $u : X \to \mathrm{Fivebrane}_{\mathbb{Q}}$ be rational* Fivebrane *gauge transformation. Then there is a fibration*

$$\mathrm{Map}_{u}(X; \mathrm{Fivebrane}_{\mathbb{Q}}, \mathrm{String}_{\mathbb{Q}}) \to \mathrm{Map}_{u}(X; \mathrm{Fivebrane}_{\mathbb{Q}}, \mathrm{Spin}_{\mathbb{Q}}) \to \mathrm{Map}_{pu}(X; \mathrm{String}_{\mathbb{Q}}, \mathrm{Spin}_{\mathbb{Q}}) \ .$$

We now consider the homotopy type of the gauge group $\mathcal{G}$. In particular, we will consider instances when $\mathcal{G}$ itself admits a (variant of) rational String, Fivebrane or Ninebrane cover. The following results and examples can be generalized in straightforward ways; however, we pick the dimensions indicated as these seem to be most relevant for applications. The following few results are really corollaries of a slight generalization of one of the main results in [FO09] (Theorem 3.1): If X has the homotopy type of a CW complex then the homotopy groups of the gauge group are given as

$$\pi_q^{\mathbb{Q}}(\mathcal{G}(P)) \cong \sum_{r \geqslant 0} H^r(X; \mathbb{Q}) \otimes \pi_{r+q}^{\mathbb{Q}}(G) \ . \tag{3.1}$$

$$\pi_q^{\mathbb{Q}}(\mathcal{G}_0(P)) \cong \sum_{r \geqslant 0} \tilde{H}^r(X; \mathbb{Q}) \otimes \pi_{r+q}^{\mathbb{Q}}(G) \ . \tag{3.2}$$

The statement and proof given in [FO09] are for G a Lie group. However, we observe that the proof goes through for our kind of abelian topological groups. In our case, the relevant homotopy groups are $\pi_{4i-1}^{\mathbb{Q}}(G)$ for $i \geqslant 1$. This then admits an interplay with $H^{4k}(X; \mathbb{Q})$, somewhat similar to the kind of relations we encountered in the variations of the Spin-Fivebrane and Spin-Ninebrane structures in Sec. 3.2 and Sec. 3.3.

Proposition 28. *Let $P \to X$ be a principal G bundle on an n-dimensional mainfold X where the group G is k-connected. Then the gauge group $\mathcal{G}(P)$ is q-connected where $q = k - n$.*

Proof. This follows directly from the formula for the homotopy groups of the gauge group. For the values $q \leqslant k - n$, we have $\pi_{q+r}^{\mathbb{Q}}(G) = 0$ by assumption and thus $\pi_{r+q}^{\mathbb{Q}}(G) = 0$ for $r \leqslant n$. □

Specializing to the case where the group G is a connected cover of $\mathrm{O}(n)$, we notice that as a feature of Bott periodicity, the homotopy groups of the gauge group are periodic. Recall that for the rational Spin group, Bott periodicity says that $\pi_i(\mathrm{Spin}_{\mathbb{Q}}) = \pi_{i+4}(\mathrm{Spin}_{\mathbb{Q}})$ for all $i \geqslant 0$, and $\pi_i(\mathrm{Spin}_{\mathbb{Q}}) = \mathbb{Q}$ for $i = 4k + 3$ and 0 everywhere else. This translates to gauge groups as follows.

Proposition 29. *Consider a principal G-bundle $P \to X$ where $G = \mathrm{Spin}\langle k \rangle_{\mathbb{Q}}$. The homotopy groups of the gauge group $\mathcal{G}(P)$ satisfy the following periodicity conditions*

$$\pi_q(\mathcal{G}(P)) = \pi_{q+4}(\mathcal{G}(P)) \qquad \text{and} \qquad \pi_q(\mathcal{G}_0(P)) = \pi_{q+4}(\mathcal{G}_1(P))$$

for every $q \geqslant k$.

Proof. For the case of $G = \mathrm{Spin}_{\mathbb{Q}}$, following equation (3.1) we calculate the first four homotopy groups

$$\pi_1^{\mathbb{Q}}(\mathcal{G}(P)) \cong \sum_{r \geqslant 0} H^{4r+2}(X; \mathbb{Q}) \otimes \pi_{4r+3}^{\mathbb{Q}}(G) \ , \qquad \pi_2^{\mathbb{Q}}(\mathcal{G}(P)) \cong \sum_{r \geqslant 0} H^{4r+1}(X; \mathbb{Q}) \otimes \pi_{4r+3}^{\mathbb{Q}}(G) \ ,$$

$$\pi_3^{\mathbb{Q}}(\mathcal{G}(P)) \cong \sum_{r \geqslant 0} H^{4r}(X; \mathbb{Q}) \otimes \pi_{4r+3}^{\mathbb{Q}}(G) \ , \qquad \pi_4^{\mathbb{Q}}(\mathcal{G}(P)) \cong \sum_{r \geqslant 0} H^{4r+3}(X; \mathbb{Q}) \otimes \pi_{4r+3}^{\mathbb{Q}}(G) \ ,$$

In calculating π_5, noting that $\pi_3(G) = \pi_7(G) = \mathbb{Q}$, we get $\pi_5(\mathcal{G}(P)) = \pi_1(\mathcal{G}(P))$. In general, if $L = q \bmod(4)$, then $\pi_{r+q}(G)$ is non zero for $r = 4i + 3 - L$. We further note that as $H^r(X;\mathbb{Q})$ is a $\mathbb{Q}$-vector space then tensoring by $\mathbb{Q}$ induces an isomorphism. Thus for general q we have

$$\pi_q^{\mathbb{Q}}(\mathcal{G}(P)) \cong \sum_{r\geqslant 0} H^{4r+3-L}(X;\mathbb{Q}) \otimes \pi_{4r+3-L+q}(G) \cong \sum_{r\geqslant 0} H^{4r+3-L}(X;\mathbb{Q}), \tag{3.3}$$

and as $q - L = 0 \bmod(4)$, then this equation only depends on q modulo 4 and the periodicity result follows. Now we consider the case where $G = \mathrm{Spin}\langle k\rangle_{\mathbb{Q}}$. Thus $\pi_i(G) = 0$ for $i < k$. Equation (3.3) still holds as long as $3-L+q \geqslant k$. Since $3-L \geqslant 0$, it follows that $q \geqslant k$. The proof for the based gauge group is identical. □

We observe that requiring the gauge group to be String places strong conditions both on the underlying space X as well as on the structure group G.

Corollary 30 (String cover of the gauge group)**.** *The gauge group $\mathcal{G}$ for Spin bundles over X is rationally 3-connected, i.e. we can form the rational String gauge group $\mathcal{G}\langle 3\rangle$ in the following cases:*
(i) *If $\dim X \leqslant 3$ and G is the rational String group.*
(ii) *If $\dim X \leqslant 7$ and G is the rational Fivebrane group.*
(iii) *If $\dim X \leqslant 11$ and G is the rational Ninebrane group.*

Proof. The homotopy groups through degree three of the rational gauge group from [FO09] takes the form

$$\sum_{i=0}^{3} \pi_i^{\mathbb{Q}}(\mathcal{G}(P)) \cong \bigoplus_{i=0}^{3} H^i(X;\mathbb{Q}) \otimes \pi_3^{\mathbb{Q}}(G) \oplus \bigoplus_{i=0}^{3} H^{4+i}(X;\mathbb{Q}) \otimes \pi_7^{\mathbb{Q}}(G) \oplus \bigoplus_{i=0}^{3} H^{8+i}(X;\mathbb{Q}) \otimes \pi_{11}^{\mathbb{Q}}(G) \oplus \cdots .$$

The statements then follow from imposing the condition on $\pi_i(G)$. The condition on X ensures that higher terms do not contribute. □

Note that one cannot dispose of all conditions on G in favor of conditions only on X because of the presence of $H^0(X;\mathbb{Q})$ in the formula. The situation is a little improved when considering exceptional groups.

Example 13. *Consider an E_8 bundle E on a manifold X of dimension $n \leqslant 12$. Since the first non-torsion homotopy group after $\pi_3(E_8)$ is $\pi_{15}(E_8)$ then if X is 3-connected, the based gauge group $\mathcal{G}(E)$ is $(15-n)$-connected.*

For certain nice spaces X the description is more pleasant. Consider for example the m-sphere S^m.

Example 14 (Gauge groups of bundles over spheres)**.** *Consider a G-principal bundle $G \to P \to S^m$ over the m-sphere. Then the homotopy groups are shown in* [Wo07] *to be related as $\pi_n^{\mathbb{Q}}(\mathcal{G}(P)) \cong \pi_{n+m}^{\mathbb{Q}}(G) \oplus \pi_n^{\mathbb{Q}}(G)$.*
(i) *For S^4, the gauge group $\mathcal{G}(P)$ is rationally 3-connected if G is rationally 7-connected.*
(ii) *For S^8, the gauge group $\mathcal{G}(P)$ is rationally 3-connected if G is rationally 11-connected.*

We can also study the homotopy groups of the universal bundles.

Example 15. *Consider the universal bundle* $\mathrm{Spin} \to E\mathrm{Spin} \xrightarrow{\xi_u} B\mathrm{Spin}$. *Then applying* [FO09, Thm. 4.2] *leads to $\pi_k^{\mathbb{Q}}(\mathcal{G}(\xi_u) = \sum_{r\geqslant 0} H^r(B\mathrm{Spin};\mathbb{Q}) \otimes \pi_{r+k}(\mathrm{Spin})$. Now since the non-torsion generators of the cohomology of B*Spin *occur only in degrees that are multiples of 4 and since, by transgression, the non-torsion homotopy groups are in degrees $4n+3$, it follows that $\mathcal{G}(\xi_u)$ is 2-connected. Applying Proposition 29, it follows that $\pi_k^{\mathbb{Q}}(\mathcal{G}(\xi_u) = 0$ if $k \neq 4n+3$. Thus insisting to have a higher structure on $\mathcal{G}(\xi_u)$ turns out to be drastic.*

Remark 7. *The formulation of the rational gauge group as the rational mapping space* $\mathrm{Map}(X, G)$ *comes close to the formulation via (topological or smooth) stacks. Indeed, in stacks one builds a global object by starting from open subsets of* X *and intersections thereof into* G*. The group* G *can be taken to be a higher group, i.e. an n-group, which model the connected cover groups that we consider here. However, as we discussed in the Introduction, the aim is to keep our tools as classical as possible in this paper.*

3.5. **Applications.** In this section we will consider systems arising from gauge theory, string theory and M-theory. This will not require detailed knowledge of these systems but rather only some basic concepts from geometry and topology, with the main ingredient being the form of the action functionals that these take. With that in mind, we will keep the discussion concise, although a more thorough discussion is possible.

Insisting that the partition function Z of the topological part of the action functional S be defined and well-defined as a function on the moduli space of fields imposes conditions on the underlying manifolds and bundles on them, in the form of constraints on primary (and possibly secondary) characteristic classes. A very classical example is Dirac's theory of fermions, which requires a Spin bundle lift of the tangent bundle, i.e. the underlying spacetime M has to satisfy $w_2(M) = 0$. Other instances arise in string theory and M-theory where a lift to one of the higher connected covers discussed earlier is needed (see [SSS09] [SSS12] [Sa14]).

It is natural to ask whether the physical entities, e.g. S or Z, depend on the underlying geometric and topological structures on spacetime: How do the physical entities behave under the variation of a corresponding structure? For instance, for Chern-Simons theory, the variation of the Spin structure was considered in [Je04], where two Spin structures essentially differ by some real line bundle. Hence once $w_2(M) = 0$ is satisfied we seek dependence on the elements in $w_1(M)$ (or more precisely of some bundle on the moduli space). In going to higher structures, in [Sa10] dependence of the membrane partition function on the underlying String structure imposed was studied via gerbes as elements in $H^3(M; \mathbb{Z})$, making use of variations in [Re11]. Since the M2-brane worldvolume is 3-dimensional, then it automatically admits a String structure. The main point in [Sa10] is to identify the action functional as a String class, i.e. as a variation of the String structure.

What we would like to do here is interpret certain prominent action functionals in string theory and M-theory as arising from varying some underlying topological structures. In fact, for the case of framed manifolds, in [Sa13], topological parts of the action functionals for the membrane (M2-brane) and the fivebrane (M5-brane) worldvolume theories [1] were interpreted via a change of framing formula, in the spirit of the variational principle. Here we adopt that point of view, leading us to interpret the topological actions functionals as variations of higher structures. Being in the rational setting makes the identification more direct and transparent. We emphasize that, while we start with de Rham expressions, we will be interested in Lagrangians and action functionals promoted (explicitly or implicitly) to the level of cohomology.

Example 16 (The M5-brane action and variation of Spin-Fivebrane structures)**.** *Consider the M5-brane on an extended worldvolume, which is a seven-dimensional Spin manifold* X^7*. The action functional of the M5-brane has been considered in* [Sa10] *and* [FSS14] *from the point of view of String bundles with String connections. This is given as*

$$S_{M5} = \int_{X^7} C_3 \wedge G_4 \ ,$$

where C_3 *is interpreted in* [Sa10] *as a String structure* $\mathcal{S}$*. The integrand is of the form* $\mathcal{S} \wedge \phi$*, with* $\phi = G_4$ *being a rational degree four cohomology class. Indeed,* G_4 *integrally satisfies the quantization condition (see*

[1] The presence of this homological object as a subspace in M-theory was one of the main reasons for the name of the corresponding structure in [SSS09].

[Wi97]*)* $G_4 + \frac{1}{2}Q_1 \in H^4(Y^{11};\mathbb{Z})$*, where* Y^{11} *is the ambient spacetime into which* X^7 *(and its bounding space) is mapped. When we rationalize, the requirement that the first Spin characteristic class* $Q_1 = \frac{1}{2}p_1$ *is divisible by two (i.e.* Y^{11} *admitting a "Membrane structure"* [Sa11b]*) is automatically satisfied, and then* $G_4 \in H^4(Y^{11};\mathbb{Q})$*. Therefore, we identify the integrand, i.e. the Lagrangian at the level of cohomology, as the difference of two rational Spin-Fivebrane structures on* Y^{11}*, i.e.*

$$\mathcal{L}_{M5} = \mathcal{F}_{\mathbb{Q}} - \mathcal{F}'_{\mathbb{Q}} \ .$$

As in the case of the 3-dimensional M2-brane worldvolume admitting a String structure [Sa10]*, the extended M5-brane worldvolume admits a Fivebrane structure by virtue of it being 7-dimensional.*

Example 17 (The M-theory action and variation of Spin-Ninebrane structures)**.** *We now consider M-theory on a String manifold* Y^{11}*, as in* [Sa11a]*. The known topological action functional of M-theory is given as*

$$\int_{Y^{11}} \left(\tfrac{1}{6}G_4 \wedge G_4 \wedge C_3 - I_8 \wedge C_3\right) \tag{3.4}$$

where $I_8 = \frac{1}{48}(p_2 - \lambda^2)$ *is called the one-loop polynomial. Properly describing this action and the corresponding partition function (or path integral) is involved due to the presence of subtle torsion (see* [FM06]*). However, we will evade all that when we rationalize. Having already the interpretation of* C_3 *is as String class* $\mathcal{S}$*, we now interpret* $\frac{1}{6}G_4 \wedge G_4 - I_8$ *as a rational cohomology class* $y_8 \in H^8(Y^{11};\mathbb{Q})$*. In* [SSS09] [SSS12] *this was done at the integral level. Then we have that the Lagrangian, again at the level of cohomology, is a variation of a rational Spin-Ninebrane class*

$$\mathcal{L}_{M} = \mathcal{N}_{\mathbb{Q}} - \mathcal{N}'_{\mathbb{Q}} \ ,$$

where we identify y_8 *with* $\pi^*_{\mathrm{Spin}}\psi_8$*, and where we take* $\pi^*_{\mathrm{Spin}}\phi_4$ *to be zero. By dimension reasons, we now automatically have a Ninebrane structure on* Y^{11} *and the action functional captures the trivialization of that structure in the form of a Spin-Ninebrane structure.*

The next two examples are on the Green-Schwarz anomaly cancellation, which is one of the main highlights of string theory.

Example 18 (The dual Green-Schwarz anomaly and variation of Spin-Fivebrane structures)**.** *The dual Green-Schwarz anomaly cancellation arises in heterotic string theory (or type I supergravity). The system involves a ten-dimensional manifold* M^{10} *with its natural Spin bundle, a Yang-Mills bundle* E*, and a cohomology class* H_7 *of degree seven. The bundle* E *enters the expressions via its Chern character* $\mathrm{ch}(E)$ *while the natural bundles are accounted for via the Pontrjagin classes* $p_i(TM^{10})$*. The action functional involves a term of the form*

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{dual } GS} = H_7 \wedge J_4 \ ,$$

where $J_4 = p_1(TM^{10}) - \mathrm{ch}_2(E)$*. Then the cohomology class corresponding to this action functional is given as the difference*

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{dual } GS} = \mathcal{N}_{\mathbb{Q}} - \mathcal{N}'_{\mathbb{Q}} \ ,$$

where we identify H_7 *with the Spin-Fivebrane class* $\mathcal{F}$*,* J_4 *with the form* $\pi^*_{\mathrm{Spin}}\phi_4$*, and where we take* $\pi^*_{\mathrm{Spin}}\psi_8$ *to be zero.*

Example 19 (The Green-Schwarz anomaly cancellation mechanism and variation of Spin-Fivebrane structures)**.** *This anomaly cancellation arises in heterotic string theory (or type I supergravity). The system again involves a ten-dimensional manifold* M^{10} *with its natural Spin bundle, a Yang-Mills bundle* E*, but now a cohomology class* H_3 *of degree three. The corresponding action functional includes*

$$\mathcal{L}_{GS} = H_3 \wedge J_8 \ ,$$

where $J_8 = -\mathrm{ch}_4(E) + \frac{1}{48}p_1(M)\mathrm{ch}_2(E) - \frac{1}{64}p_1(M)^2 + \frac{1}{48}p_2(TM)$*. The class* H_3 *can be identified with the String class* $\mathcal{S}$*, so that the expression at the level of cohomology is of the form*

$$\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{S} \cdot \psi_8 \ ,$$

where the rational cohomology class ψ_8 *is identified with* J_8*. Note that considerable constraints are needed in order to ensure the latter is an integral class (see* [SSS09] *for a discussion on when this is the case). Working rationally evades these complications.*

Remark 8. **(i)** *Another string theory, namely type I admits a duality-symmetric formulation, with the dual formulation using* H_7 *given in* [Ca96]*. A similar discussion holds in this case.*
(ii) *It is also possible to consider duality-symmetric M-theory action by supplementing the dual to the action to* (3.4) *where we would have both* $\pi^*_{\mathrm{Spin}}\psi_4$ *and* $\pi^*_{\mathrm{Spin}}\phi_8$ *nonzero in general. Hence this involves involves variations of both Spin-Fivebrane and Spin-Ninebrane structures.*
(iii)*Similarly, the duality-symmetric heterotic action (by combining Examples 18 and 19) would involve both* $\pi^*_{\mathrm{Spin}}\psi_4$ *and* $\pi^*_{\mathrm{Spin}}\phi_8$*, hence also leading to variation of both structures as in (ii).*

We find it notable that all three actions in M-theory, i.e. that of the M2-brane, the M5-brane, and of classical M-theory, as well as the Green-Schwarz anomaly and its dual, can be interpreted as trivializations of higher structures with the rational Spin-Fivebrane and Spin-Ninebrane structures able to account for the form as well as the compositeness of the actions. The above discussion can be summarized in the following table.

System	**Existing rational structure**	**New interpretation**
Chern-Simons theory	Riemannian	Variation of Spin structure
M2-brane theory	Spin	Variation of String structure
M5-brane theory, dual Green-Schwarz	String	Variation of Fivebrane structure
M-theory, Green-Schwarz	String/Fivebrane	Variation of Ninebrane structure

Acknowledgement. The authors would like to thank Corbett Redden for useful discussions especially at the initial stages of this project, and Sadok Kallel, Mark Grant, Paolo Salvatore, and Sam Smith for useful comments.

References

[AM76] J. F. Adams and Z. Mahmud, *Maps between classifying spaces*, Inventiones Math. **35** (1976), 1-41.

[Ar89] M. Arkowitz, *Categories equivalent to the category of rational H-spaces*, Manuscripta Math. **64** (1989), no. 4, 419–429.

[Ba81] A. Back, *Rational Pontryagin classes and Killing forms*, J. Differential Geom. **16** (1981), no. 2, 191-193.

[BS09] J. Baez and D. Stevenson, *The classifying space of a topological 2-group*, Algebraic topology, 1–31, Abel Symp., 4, Springer, Berlin, 2009.

[BHMV95] C. Blanchet, N. Habegger, G. Masbaum, and P. Vogel, *Topological quantum field theories derived from the Kaufman bracket*, Topology **34** (1995), 883-927.

[BK72] A. K. Bousfield and D. M. Kan, *Homotopy Limits, Completions and Localizations*, volume 304 of Lecture Notes in Mathematics, Springer-Verlag, 1972.

[BG76] A. Bousfield and V. Gugenheim, *On PL de Rham theory and rational homotopy type*, Memoirs of the Amer. Math. Soc. **179** (8), 1976.

[BN14] U. Bunke and N. Naumann, *Secondary Invariants for String Bordism and tmf*, Bull. Sci. Math. **138** (2014), 912-970, arXiv:0912.4875.

[Ca96] A. H. Chamseddine, *A Family of dual N=2 supergravity actions in ten-dimensions*, Phys. Lett. **B367** (1996) 134–139.

[CHZ11] Q. Chen, F. Han, and W. Zhang, *Generalized Witten genus and vanishing theorems*, J. Differential Geom. **88** (2011), 1–39.

[Co98] R. L. Cohen, *The Topology of Fiber Bundles*, Lecture Notes 1998, `http://math.stanford.edu/~ralph/fiber.pdf`

[CG13] D. Crowley and S. Goette, *Kreck-Stolz invariants for quaternionic line bundles*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **365** (2013), no. 6, 3193-3225.

[Cu68] C. J. Curjel, *On the H-space structures of finite complexes*, Comment. Math. Helv. **43** (1968),1–17.

[De99] A. Dessai, *Some geometric properties of the Witten genus*, Alpine perspectives on algebraic topology, 99–115, Contemp. Math., 504, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2009.

[ERW15] J. Ebert and O. Randal-Williams, *Torelli spaces of high-dimensional manifolds*, J. Topol. **8** (2015), no. 1, 38–64.

[Es05] Ch. M. Escher, *A diffeomorphism classification of generalized Witten manifolds*, Geom. Dedicata **115** (2005), 79–120.

[Fa96] E. Dror Farjoun, *Cellular spaces, null spaces and homotopy localization*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. 1622, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1996.

[FHT01] Y. Félix, S. Halperin, and J.-C. Thomas, *Rational Homotopy Theory*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics 205, Springer, 2001.

[FHT15] Y. Félix, S. Halperin, and J.-C. Thomas, *Rational Homotopy Theory II*, World Scientific, Singapore, 2015.

[FO09] Y. Félix and J. Oprea, *Rational homotopy of gauge groups*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **137** (2009), no. 4, 1519-1527.

[FOT08] Y. Félix, J. Oprea, and D. Tanre, *Algebraic models in geometry*, Oxford University Press, 2008.

[FSS14] D. Fiorenza, H. Sati, and U. Schreiber, *Multiple M5-branes, string 2-connections, and 7d nonabelian Chern-Simons theory*, Adv. Theor. Math. Phys. **18** (2014), no. 2, 229–321, [`arXiv:1201.5277`] [hep-th].

[FSS15] D. Fiorenza, H. Sati, and U. Schreiber, *The E_8 moduli 3-stack of the C-field in M-theory*, Comm. Math. Phys. **333** (2015), no. 1, 117–151, [`arXiv:1202.2455`] [hep-th].

[FSS12] D. Fiorenza, U. Schreiber, and J. Stasheff, *Čech cocycles for differential characteristic classes: an ∞-Lie theoretic construction*, Adv. Theor. Math. Phys. **16** (2012), no. 1, 149–250.

[FSV16] D. Fiorenza, U. Schreiber, and A. Valentino, *Central extensions of mapping class groups from characteristic classes*, [`arXiv:1503.00888`] [math.AT].

[Fr84] P. Fré, *Comments on the 6-index photon in d=11 supergravity and the gauging of free differential algebras*, Classical Quantum Gravity **1** (1984), no. 6, L81–L90.

[Fr00] D. S. Freed, *Dirac charge quantization and generalized differential cohomology*, Surveys in differential geometry, 129–194, Surv. Differ. Geom., VII, Int. Press, Somerville, MA, 2000.

[FM06] D. Freed and G. W. Moore, *Setting the quantum integrand of M-theory*, Comm. Math. Phys. **263** (2006), no. 1, 89–132.

[GM13] P. A. Griffiths and J. W. Morgan, *Rational homotopy theory and differential forms*, second edition, Progress in Mathematics, Springer, New York, 2013.

[Gr74] E. A. Grove, SU(n) *actions on differentiable manifolds with vanishing first and second integral Pontrjagin classes*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **196** (1974), 331–350.

[Ha82] A. Haefliger, *Rational homotopy of the space of sections of a nilpotent bundle*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc **273** (1982), 609-620.

[Ha81] V. L. Hansen, *Spaces of maps into Eilenberg-MacLane spaces*, Canad. J. Math. **XXXI** (1981), 782-785.

[Ha02] A. Hatcher, *Algebraic Topology*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2002.

[He07] K. Hess, *Rational homotopy theory: a brief introduction*, Interactions between homotopy theory and algebra, 175-202, Contemp. Math., 436, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2007.

[HMR75] P. Hilton, G. Mislin, and J. Roitberg, *Localization of nilpotent groups and spaces*, North Holland Publishing Co. , Amsterdam, 1975.

[HH67] W.-C. Hsiang and W.-Y. Hsiang, *Differentiable actions of compact connected classical groups I*, Amer. J. Math. **89** (1967) 705–786.

[Hu94] D. Husemoller, *Fibre Bundles*, Springer-Verlag, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, third edition, 1994.

[Je04] J. A. Jenquin, *Spin TQFTs and Chern-Simons gauge theory*, Thesis (Ph.D.), The University of Texas at Austin, 2004, 145 pp, ISBN: 978-0496-01770-6.

[KSS09] J. R. Klein, C. L. Schochet, and S. B. Smith, *Continuous trace C*-algebras, gauge groups and rationalization*, J. Topol. Anal. **1** (2009), no. 3, 261–288, [`arXiv:0811.0771`] [math.AT].

[Ki88] T. P. Killingback, *Global anomalies, string theory and spacetime topology*, Classical Quantum Gravity **5** (1988), no. 9, 1169–1185.

[KR94] L. Kramer, *The topology of smooth projective planes*, Arch. Math. (Basel) **63** (1994), no. 1, 85–91.

[Kr02] L. Kramer, *Homogeneous spaces, Tits buildings, and isoparametric hypersurfaces*, Mem. Amer. Math. Soc. **158** (2002), no. 752, xvi+114 pp.

[KS88] M. Kreck and S. Stolz, *A diffeomorphism classification of 7-dimensional homogeneous Einstein manifolds with* SU(3) × SU(2) × U(1)*-symmetry*, Ann. of Math. **(2) 127** (1988), no. 2, 373–388.

[LPSS09] G. Lupton, N. C. Phillips, C. L. Schochet, and S. B. Smith, *Banach algebras and rational homotopy theory*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **361** (2009), 267–295.

[MM97] C. A. McGibbon and J. M. Møller, *Connected covers and Neisendorfer's localization theorem*, Fund. Math. **152** (1997), no. 3, 211–230.

[Mi59] J. Milnor, *On spaces having the homotopy type of a CW-complex*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **90** (1959), 272–280.

[MS74] J. Milnor and J. Stasheff, *Characteristic Classes*, Annals of Mathematics Studies, Princeton University Press, 1974.

[Mø87] J. M. Møller, *Spaces of sections of Eilenberg-MacLane fibrations*, Pacific J. Math. **130** (1987), 171-186.

[Mø02] J. M. Møller, *Rational equivalences between classifying spaces*, Math. Z. **241** (2002), no. 4, 761–799.

[Mo93] H. Morimoto, *A combinatorial criterion for the vanishing of Pontryagin classes*, Topology Appl. **53** (1993), 205–220.

[Mo01] S. Morita, *Geometry of characteristic classes*, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2001.

[Ne95] J. A. Neisendorfer, *Localization and connected covers of finite complexes*, The Čech centennial (Boston, MA, 1993), Contemp. Math., vol. 181, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1995, pp. 385–390.

[No95] D. Notbohm, *On the functor "Classifying space" for compact Lie groups*, J. London Math. Soc. **(2) 2** (1995), no. 1, 185–198.

[No65] S. Novikov, *Rational Pontryagin classes. Homeomorphism and homotopy type of closed manifolds I*, Izv. Akad. Nauk SSSR Ser. Mat. **29** (1965), 1373–1388.

[Os92] A. Osse, *Sur le classifant d'un groupe de Lie compact connexe*, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér I Math. **315** (1992), no. 7, 833–838.

[Pi93] R. A. Piccinini, *Lectures on homotopy theory*, North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam, 1992.

[RW10] A. Ranicki and M. S. Weiss, *On the construction and topological invariance of the Pontryagin classes*, Geom. Dedicata **148** (2010), 309–343, [arXiv:0901.0819] [math.AT].

[Re11] C. Redden, *String structures and canonical 3-forms*, Pacific J. Math. **249** (2011), no. 2, 447–484.

[Ro16] M. Rovelli, *A characteristic long exact sequence for principal bundles*, [arXiv:1610.08893] [math.AT].

[Sa10] H. Sati, *Geometric and topological structures related to M-branes*, Superstrings, geometry, topology, and C^*-algebras, 181–236, Proc. Sympos. Pure Math., 81, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2010, [arXiv:1001.5020] [math.DG].

[Sa11a] H. Sati, *Anomalies of E_8 gauge theory on string manifolds*, Internat. J. Modern Phys. **A 26** (2011), no. 13, 2177–2197, [arXiv:0807.4940] [hep-th].

[Sa11b] H. Sati, *Twisted topological structures related to M-branes*, Int. J. Geom. Methods Mod. Phys. **8** (2011), no. 5, 1097–1116, [arXiv:1008.1755] [hep-th].

[Sa13] H. Sati, *Framed M-branes, corners, and topological invariants*, [arXiv:1310.1060] [hep-th].

[Sa14] H. Sati, *Ninebrane structures*, Int. J. Geom. Methods Mod. Phys. **12** (2015), no. 4, 1550041, 24 pp., [arXiv:1405.7686] [hep-th].

[SS15] H. Sati and H.-b. Shim, *String structures associated to indefinite Lie groups*, [arXiv:1504.02088] [math-ph].

[SSS09] H. Sati, U. Schreiber, and J. Stasheff, *Fivebrane structures*, Rev. Math. Phys. **21** (2009), no. 10, 1197–1240, [arXiv:0805.0564] [math.AT].

[SSS12] H. Sati, U. Schreiber, and J. Stasheff, *Twisted differential String and Fivebrane structures*, Comm. Math. Phys. **315** (2012), no. 1, 169–213, [arXiv:0910.4001] [math.AT].

[Se04] G. Segal, *The definition of conformal field theory*, Topology, geometry and quantum field theory London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Ser., 308, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, (2004), 421-577.

[SW86] N. Seiberg and E. Witten, *Spin structures in string theory*, Nuclear Phys. **B 276** (1986), no. 2, 272–290.

[Si82] W. Singhof, *Parallelizability of homogeneous spaces I*, Math. Ann. **260** (1982), no. 1, 101-116.

[Sm01] S. B. Smith, *Rational type of classifying space for fibrations*, Contemp. Math. **274** (2001), 299-307.

[St99] N. Steenrod, *The Topology of Fibre Bundles*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1999.

[ST04] S. Stolz and P. Teichner, *What is an elliptic object?*, Topology, geometry and quantum field theory, 247–343, London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Ser., 308, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 2004.

[St13] J. Strom, *Idempotent functors that preserve cofiber sequences and split suspensions*, Algebr. Geom. Topol. **13** (2013) 2335-2346, arXiv:1205.2140 [math.AT].

[Su74] D. Sullivan, *Genetics of homotopy theory and the Adams conjecture*, Ann. of Math. **(2) 100** (1974), 1–79.

[Th57] R. Thom, *L'homologie des espaces fonctionelles*, Colloque de topologie algebrique, Louvain 1956. Thone, Liege; Masson, Paris, 1957, 29-39.

[We15] M. S. Weiss, *Dalian notes on Pontryagin classes*, [arXiv:1507.00153] [math.AT].

[Wh16] M. Wheeler, *Rational structures and fractional differential refinements*, PhD Thesis, University of Pittsburgh, 2016.

[Wh52] G. W. Whitehead, *Fiber spaces and the Eilenberg homology groups*, Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. USA **38** (1952), 426–430.

[Wi85] E. Witten, *Global anomalies in string theory*, Symposium on anomalies, geometry, topology (Chicago, Ill., 1985), 61–99, World Sci. Publishing, Singapore, 1985.

[Wi97] E. Witten, *On flux quantization in M-theory and the effective action*, J. Geom. Phys. 22 (1997), no. 1, 1–13.

[Wo07] C. Wockel, *The Samelson product and rational homotopy for gauge groups*, Abh. Math. Sem. Univ. Hamburg **77** (2007) 219-228.

E-mail address: hsati@pitt.edu, mgwheeler@math.arizona.edu